VOLUME IX NUMBER 1

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

JANUARY 1935

EDITORIAL

One of the Most Acute Problems that Faces Organized Christianity today is the problem of the relationship of Church and State. In Russia the state has sought and is seeking to destroy the church. In Germany the state is apparently seeking to make the church serve the state. The program of the German state has led to a crisis in the relation of the two institutions which may have far-reaching consequences. The growing tendency toward dictatorships round the world will certainly lead to more clashes of a similar sort in the future. The fundamental cause of the difficulty both in Russia and in Germany is to be sought in the conflicting claims of two institutions both of which profess absolute sovereignty.

But the clash of these two sovereignties of state and church has occurred before. And even in more democratic states, there has always been one crucial point on which the Christian conscience and the demands of the state have inescapably clashed, that is, whenever the Christian conscience has resolutely adopted the ethic of the New Testament on the question of the use of force, particularly in the form of organized warfare.

The Mennonite church has, on the whole, since its foundation in 1525, consistently accepted the New Testament ethic on war and peace, and has in consequence frequently been brought into conflict with the state. The first two articles in this issue of the Review discuss the problem of the Christian's attitude toward the state in time of war as it presents itself to nonresistant groups today, such as the Mennonites. Both are papers read before the recent Mennonite Conference on War and Peace held at Goshen Col-

lege under the auspices of the Mennonite Peace Problems Committee of the Mennonite General Conference. Both papers present the historical background of the problem as it faces Christians today and both come to grips with the realities of the situation. The authors are members of the Goshen College faculty, G. F. Hershberger, Professor of History, and Edward Yoder, Professor of Latin and Greek.

At First Glance, It Might Seem that the Thorough Paper by Professor Umble on the topic "Elkhart Institute moves to Goshen" has a purely local historical interest. It is very valuable from this point of view, and constitutes a contribution toward a history of Goshen College, but it has a larger significance in that it discloses the play of forces in church and community as they affected the welfare of an institution that has meant much in the life of the Mennonite Church, and thereby gives the setting for the future development of the institution.

THE CHRISTIAN'S RELATION TO THE STATE IN TIME OF WAR

I. The Christian's Attitude Toward Participation in War Activities*

EDWARD YODER

The general theme for the present session of this Conference on War and Peace is The Christian's Relation to the State in Time of War. Before taking up the immediate topic of this paper it may be permissible to preface a few things bearing upon the Christian's relation in general to the State. Since this question in some form underlies all the practical applications of peace and nonresistance by the individual Christian, and since also no other subject on the program of the conference appears to come closer to this question than the present one, it seems fitting first of all to set down a few general considerations on what are some of the principles involved in the Christian's relation to the political state. We speak of the Christian's relation to the State in time of war. Is the Christian's relation to the State in time of war in any way different from that at other times, say in time of peace? The particular problems that arise out of this relationship are of course different in time of war from what they are in time of peace. Yet the relation of the Christian believer to the State should be consistent, should be based upon the same principles in all times, in times of peace as in times of war. Perhaps the reason Christians are confused about what to do in wartime is explained by the fact that they do not understand what their relation is to the State in peace time.

The relation of the Christian to the State has been a problem in about every age since the origin of Christianity. Various answers to the question have been attempted along the way and it may be interesting as well as of value to note some facts bearing upon this problem in a brief historical survey. Only representative incidents can be cited here and a few leading theories about the relation of Church and State can be barely mentioned. We may begin by referring to the New Testament Scriptures for information as to Jesus' attitude toward the secular state. Someone has said that Jesus'

* A paper read at the Mennonite Conference on Peace and War, held at Goshen College under the auspices of the Peace Problems Committee of the Mennonite General Conference, February 15 to 17, 1935.

attitude to the State was one of practical indifference. His kingdom is not of this world, as He explained to Pontius Pilate, but it is a spiritual, other-worldly dominion. Many Jews of Palestine in Christ's time entertained strong nationalistic ambitions and Messianic hopes of a temporal nature. But Jesus definitely discouraged their aspirations and refused to lend Himself to their purposes in that direction.

Jesus had contacts with three governments of His day, the Roman imperial government, the government of Herod Antipas in Galilee, and the government of the Jewish Sanhedrin at Jerusalem. He recognized these as legitimate, at least by implication. When He cleansed the leper He directed him to comply with the legal requirement connected with his purification, by presenting himself to the priest with an offering. The ministrations of Jesus, His service and help, were given to government officials and their families on a personal basis even as to all other persons. We think, for instance, of His contacts with centurions, with the nobleman and others. As to Herod Antipas, although this ruler imprisoned and killed John the Baptist, His kinsman, friend and forerunner, in a wicked and unjust manner, yet no word of criticism one way or another do we read in which Jesus commented upon the ruler's deed. The contacts Jesus had with the imperial government were through the Roman procurator Pontius Pilate. When He was told of the savage act of Pilate in executing some Galileans and mingling their blood with their sacrifices, His only recorded response was an appeal for repentance and amendment of life on the part of His hearers. Confronted with the question of paying tribute to Rome, He replied that to the Emperor is to be given what belongs to him. In His final trial before Pilate, the only reference Jesus makes to political matters is to acknowledge the title "King of the Jews," but even then not as a temporal ruler in this world. Jesus foretells for His disciples and followers persecution at the hands of "kings and governors." These are mentioned as the chief source from which God's people may expect persecution. It appears then that Jesus approved, or took for granted the benevolent activities of the State, but He disapproved its crimes and abuses. The conclusion of C. J. Cadoux on this point may be worth quoting:[1] "To the State's means of coercion and penalty—in so far as they were honestly applied—Jesus accorded a certain relative approval—relative, that is, to the immaturity of those who had not learnt the meaning and potency of loving one's neighbor as oneself."

---

1 Cadoux, C. J.: *The Early Church and the World,* Edinburgh, 1925, page 49.

In the book of Acts, we find when not long after Pentecost the apostles by their preaching came into conflict with the Jewish rulers in Jerusalem that they asserted and acted upon the principle that they must obey God before human rulers. If this involved disobedience to the rulers, that was that. Paul in his missionary travels was glad to accept the rights and privileges which were legally his as a Roman citizen. The Roman officials were often his protectors against Jews and others who threatened his life, yet we do not read that he ever called upon the government to give him protection as his right, nor did he ask officials to arrest and punish his enemies who mistreated him. The writer of Acts represents the attitude of Roman officials as uniformly favorable to Paul and his helpers, so at Corinth, Ephesus, Jerusalem, Caesarea, and elsewhere.[2]

The apostles, Peter and Paul, both give specific instructions as to the Christian's attitude and relation to the State. The most extended passages on this matter are I Peter 2:13-17 and Romans 13:1-7. It is a help in understanding the significance of these instructions to Christians, to grasp something of the conditions under which the early Christians lived. The Roman state of their day was religious as well as political in its nature. In the first century of our era, at the time when Christianity was being cradled in Palestine and was taking its first steps toward the conquest of the world, State worship and Emperor worship were taking definite shape. Colleges of priests, ceremonies, all the paraphernalia of a cult, were growing up around the worship of the Emperor as the head of the world. He was honored widely in documents with such titles as god, lord, saviour, the same titles with which Christians were honoring their Lord Jesus Christ.[3]

The Christian converts were taught by the missionaries as an essential part of the Gospel message to obey God above men, to worship God and Christ alone. Now it is easy to see that in this teaching was contained the germ of a movement which must sooner or later clash with the religious pretensions of the Roman state. To teach large numbers of people that they are the sons of God and that they owed their supreme allegiance to God was consciously or unconsciously to assault the very foundations of the Empire as it was then conceived. As could be expected, there seem to have been some Christians who were rashly inclined to act upon the implications of this teaching at once in a thoroughgoing way. Some ap-

---

2 Book of Acts, see chapters 18, 19, 21, 25.

3 Sweet, Louis Matthews, *Roman Emperor Worship,* Boston, 1919, Chap. VI. *et passim.*

parently were tempted to take an attitude of opposition to even legitimate phases of government. We note that Peter and Paul both found it necessary to caution Christians against the abuse of their liberty in the Gospel through rebellion against the whole imperial system which seemed to them blasphemous in its divine pretensions. The warning which Peter gives in the First Epistle, 4: 15 is very revealing. He says: "Let none of you suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or an evil-doer, or as a revolutionary." The last word here translated "revolutionary" is one that is found nowhere else in Greek literature it seems, so that there is some doubt as to its exact meaning. But occurring in the list it does here, and on other grounds, scholars think that Peter may be warning Christians against overt activities against existing government.[4] Peter, in the passage above referred to, I Peter 2:13-17, says among other things: "Submit to every human institution for the Lord's sake, whether to the Emperor as supreme, or to governors as (men) sent by him. . . . Honor the Emperor." Probably Peter wrote this at a time of persecution against the Christians, expecting that a more submissive attitude toward legitimate phases of government on their part would tend to mitigate the persecution. By counselling them to "honor the Emperor" he could not have meant, of course, giving him the reverence and worship which the Emperor then received from many of his subjects.

The Apostle Paul in Romans, the thirteenth chapter, besides giving instructions to Christians on their duties to the State, sets forth also a theory of the State. He says that the existing powers are ordained of God for the restraint and punishment of evil-doers and for the protection and reward of the good. In actual practice we know that the State has often persecuted good people, has many times in history tried to restrain and punish the righteous who were God's people. In what sense then is human government ordained of God? Is it perhaps in this, that God has created man with such a nature and such instincts that men will naturally seek to set up some system of corporate control and guidance for themselves? Even as the mating instinct in human beings affords the basis for the institution of marriage, so the social and political instincts in men give the basis for human government. All this does not say that God directly institutes particular forms of government of particular individuals as its officials. When a government does wrong, such as persecuting Christians and fighting against God, as in recent Russia, such action becomes the crime of those who are

---

[4] Cadoux, C. J.: *op. cit.*, page 100, footnote 2.

responsible for the action. Hence to oppose a government's orders when they are wrong is a duty, for Christians must obey God rather than men. It is true that Paul wrote his instructions of submission to government, instructions which he does not specifically qualify in any way, during the reign of the Emperor Nero who in history has the reputation for being a wicked and despotic ruler. But Paul evidently wrote the epistle to the Romans during the early part of Nero's reign when, as C. J. Cadoux says:[5] "peace and good government prevailed, and before either the odious vices of Nero's personal character had become a public scandal or the policy of treating Christianity as a *religio illicita* had been begun. Hence the apostle felt no occasion to provide for cases of conflict between government orders and Christian duty. He was writing with the special object of counteracting a dangerous tendency on the part of a set of fractious enthusiasts in the Roman Church." We know too that Paul appreciated the blessings of peace and order which a stable government secured. He encourages Christians "that supplications, prayers, petitions, thanksgivings be made for all men—for Emperors and all who are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and tranquil life in all piety and gravity." So much for the teachings of the New Testament Scriptures themselves.

When Christianity had spread widely and the Empire finally capitulated before its steady advance a new situation confronted Christians. The State was now no longer the persecutor of Christians, but their protector and defender. The State was ostensibly Christian, governed by professed Christians. But experience proved that the ethics and teachings of Jesus could not be followed out in political and governmental activities. Violence and war seemed unavoidable for the State, and yet Jesus had forbidden the use of these to His followers. St. Augustine (354-430), in his great work, *de Civitate Dei,* first worked out a scheme which he supposed would reconcile the conflict. He said that Church and State are parallel in authority, both being used of God in His universal sovereignty for the guidance of the world, the one being supreme in the material realm and the other in the spiritual realm. The individual Christian, he thought, would divide his loyalty equally between the two as particular occasions might demand. There could be no absolute conflict of duty here for the Christian, for he was serving God equally when he obeyed the State's orders and when he submitted to the Church.

In substance Augustine's idea has in some form dominated

---

[5] *Ibid.,* page 112.

much of the Christian thinking on the relation of Church and State since his time. In practice, of course, the matter is not as simple as Augustine supposed. For sovereignty implies supremacy and two equal and parallel sovereignties side by side are not possible for long. In practice too such a working together of Church and State seems always to have resulted in setting aside the plain ethical teachings of Jesus, that His followers shall love their enemies, do good to all men, and not resist evil men. More often these teachings were not deliberately and consciously set aside, but by the practical pressure of expediency they were rationalized into reasons for obeying the State's orders to go to war and kill enemies. Since, so runs the argument, God ordains and uses the State in His purposes, Christians serve God equally when they fight for their government as when they love their neighbors.[6]

The so-called peace sects, of which the Mennonites are one, have generally held that such a divided allegiance on the part of the Christian is unscriptural, and in literal fact is an impossibility. For as Jesus said, "No man can serve two masters." The Christian who attempts to comply with the teachings of the New Testament and also with all the demands of a political state will necessarily make the one literal and will proceed to rationalize the other away. For the two sovereignties inevitably do conflict at some time, and experience shows that most often it is the teachings of Jesus which men set aside in a time of crisis or conflict between the two. Mennonites base their attitude of non-participation in a state's war activities upon the premise that the Christian, if he takes his allegiance to Christ seriously, cannot under any circumstances refuse to follow Christ nor can he explain away the teachings of Christ and still be doing the will of God. For them it would be rebellion, if not idolatry, against God to aid in any activities that have as their aim the killing of enemies or the use of violence against them, even at the command of a government. The spirit and the letter of Jesus' teachings as understood by them are against the use of violence, force, injury against a fellowman.

Throughout their history of over four hundred years, Mennonites have avoided or resisted military service in many countries where they have lived. They have migrated from land to land about the world in order to escape the clutches of the military arm of states. Of course, their persecution has not always been due to their refusal to join in war activities. In fact for the first three centuries it was not as a rule the pressure of militarism which caused

---

[6] Heering, G. J.: *The Fall of Christianity*, tr., London, 1930, pages 69-74.

them to migrate from place to place. It was oftener their quest for freedom of worship and freedom of faith that led them on. Religious toleration was not the rule in European countries then and they were persecuted as religious heretics by established churches and by their supporting governments. The reason military pressure was a small factor before the nineteenth century is explained by the nature of warfare in the preceding centuries and the methods by which it was carried on. Armies were small then and consisted of professional soldiers who had volunteered for such services. These small professional armies belonged to the various princes and rulers, were hired by them and used for carrying out their own political purposes.

Under such circumstances it is easy to see why nonresistant Christians had no particular difficulty in avoiding war service. They simply did not volunteer or enlist for the service. They did help to pay the heavy taxes with which rulers paid those who wanted to serve in the armies. The principal exception to this general description of causes of Mennonite persecution before the opening of the nineteenth century is found in Switzerland. And it is surprising that only in this small country, often spoken of as the cradle of freedom, the Mennonites should be persecuted for their anti-war attitude. Professor C. Henry Smith has pointed out the reasons for this.[7] Conscription was used in the Swiss cantons in the eighteenth century and even before. But the soldiers so conscripted were not used for defending their home and country; they were hired out to rulers anywhere in Europe who needed their services and had money to pay for the same. This mercenary traffic brought a good deal of handy cash income to the Cantons, and it was carried on for centuries. The eighteenth century was a period of wars in Europe, so that the business of hiring out troops was brisk. Many of the common people of Switzerland were opposed to such a system, because the money went into the pockets of certain noblemen rather than into the public treasury. The presence of the Mennonites, who refused to enlist for such mercenary armies and whose example encouraged others also to refuse, was a political thorn in the flesh of the Swiss rulers. Hence the bitter persecution directed against them, which in the course of time drove most of them out of the Cantons into the Palatinate and elsewhere.

With the nineteenth century came modern democracy. All men were now said to be free and equal, class distinctions as be-

---

7 Smith, C. Henry: *The Mennonite Immigration to Pennsylvania in the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 57-60, published in Proceedings of the Pennsylvania German Society, Vol. XXV, (1924).

tween rulers and ruled, privileged and unprivileged, were wiped out, at least in theory. The will of the people became the seat of political authority, one person was now supposed to have as loud a voice in government as another. Whether this is more fact or fancy is not our question now. What we are concerned with is the fact that warfare also became democratic. If all men are equal, then all, so the theory goes, are responsible to do their share of the fighting for their country. General conscription was first used in modern times in France during and following the Revolution. Numbers and large battalions began to count in war more than skillful maneuvering. Napoleon waged his wars with conscripted armies. Following the Napoleonic wars the leading European countries completely reorganized their military systems. Universal compulsory service and military training became the rule on the continent in the course of the nineteenth century.

This change in military methods in Europe was an important factor in the Mennonite migrations of the nineteenth century. Rather than allow their young men to become militarized in the course of time and so to stand in danger of losing their nonresistant principles, large numbers chose to migrate to new lands, whereso-ever the hope of escaping military conscription lured them on. Some of the movements which resulted were the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century migration of Mennonites from Prussia into Russia. The same factor caused the immigration of many of these same people or their descendants from Russia to the western prairies of the United States and Canada sixty years ago. There was also a strong tide of immigration of Mennonites from Switzerland and Alsace-Lorraine to the United States in the years 1820-1850 which coincided with the growing militarization of European countries. It is not necessary to suppose that these movements were in every instance due to military pressure alone. There was usually a complex of causes with economic and other elements included among them. But undoubtedly the military question often figured largely in the decision of these people to travel to strange lands and pioneer in new places.

These historical movements of Mennonites have been sketched hastily here to provide a bit of background for the problem of participation in war activities which we have to consider today. It is a sad fact that many of the Mennonites who remained in European countries have yielded to the pressure of militarism and have compromised on the principle of nonresistance. Some even have supported the militaristic program of the state, as for example, in Holland and Germany. In view of what our forebears sacrificed

in order to maintain the principle of nonresistance in past years and centuries, it is very much worth while for us to meet as we are today in this conference on war and peace in order to clarify the interpretation of our principles against warfare in the light of the changed conditions of our day and generation. We have already spoken of the ways in which the changes in military methods have affected Mennonite history in the past. It is well that in the midst of ever-changing conditions of life we consider how we may apply the principles of the Scriptures in our complex modern life and world. The further discussion will therefore survey briefly the attitude and practices of Mennonites in times of war since coming to this country. The only wars we need to consider in this connection are the War of the American Revolution, the Civil War and the late World War. It will be instructive for us to observe what Mennonites did during these times of test.

During the American Revolution not many Mennonites as yet lived outside of the Province of Pennsylvania, though there were a few in Maryland and Virginia. Actual conscription by the provincial governments was not used at this time. However all the patriots organized themselves into voluntary militia companies in Pennsylvania and tried to fasten the stigma of Toryism and disloyalty on all who did not join their companies. The Mennonites and the members of other peaceful sects were for peace and against war on principle. Besides this they were reluctant to support a revolt against the British crown, under whose government they had enjoyed such a welcome relief from persecution for their faith. But they were not actively pro-British as they had been accused of being. The Continental Congress in 1775 assured them that it intended no violence to their consciences, but urged that they contribute liberally of such services as they could to their country. The pacifist sects sent repeated petitions to committees, Assembly, and Congress in which they stated their position against warfare, and asked for consideration of their conscientious scruples on the matter. The Pennsylvania Assembly finally disposed of the matter when it "resolved that with a few exceptions, all persons between the ages of fifteen and sixty-three, who were capable of bearing arms, and did not enroll themselves among the associators must pay a fine of two pounds and ten shillings annually." Thus was laid down the fundamental principle on which military service was exacted in Pennsylvania throughout the Revolution—those who refused to serve in the militia must pay a monetary equivalent. As to the paying of the fine thus imposed and the other war levies that were made, opinion among Mennonites seems to have been divided.

The Quakers seem to have been fairly consistent in refusing to pay them and chose rather to take the consequences of such refusal. We do not know certainly what the practice of the Mennonites and Amish was on this point. In some localities it seems clear that Mennonites paid the fines. Much depended doubtless upon the strictness or leniency with which local officials collected them. The question of taking the oath of allegiance to the new government also led to a division of opinion, even leading to a division of the Church.[8]

During the Civil War both sides were forced to resort to general conscription before the end of the war. In the North, those having conscientious scruples were exempted and were permitted either to accept hospital service or to pay three hundred dollars as exemption money. It seems that Mennonites generally paid the required fee; often the members of a church joined together in raising the money for paying the fines of those who were poor. In some cases Mennonites when drafted availed themselves of the privilege of hiring substitutes to go to the army. In the South conscription was used almost from the first. Some Mennonites in Virginia when drafted went into the army but refused to fight and were imprisoned for it. Some escaped to the Northern states and others went into hiding. In 1862, Virginia passed a law exempting members of a church that forbade the bearing of arms upon the payment of five hundred dollars, and the further sum of two percent of the assessed valuation of all taxable property. Later, in 1864, the Confederate Congress repealed all exemptions, and many more went into hiding or escaped to the North. Leaders in the Mennonite and Dunker Churches in Virginia worked actively together in presenting petitions and pleas to legislature and congress in behalf of their people. Before the exemptions were repealed, Mennonites and Dunkers generally paid the exemption fees, their churches helping those who could not pay their own. This attitude was in contrast to that of many Quakers, who chose imprisonment and confiscation of goods rather than pay for their exemption. They felt that to escape service by voluntarily paying money which would be used for war purposes was not consistent nonresistance.[9]

When the United States entered the World War in April, 1917, scarcely a month passed until a universal conscription law was passed by Congress, universal in the sense that no one was exempted within the prescribed age limits. It was not possible to escape by paying a fee or by hiring a substitute. There was an

---

[8] Bender, Wilber J. in *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, October, 1927, pp. 21-29.

[9] Wright, Edward Needles: *Conscientious Objectors in the Civil War*, Philadelphia, 1931, Chapters II, III.

exemption clause which read:[10] "Nothing in this act shall be construed to require or compel any person to serve in any of the forces herein provided for who is found to be a member of any well organized religious sect or organization at present organized and existing whose creed or principles forbid its members to participate in war in any form and whose religious convictions are against war or participation therein in accordance with the creed or principles of said religious organizations, but no person so exempted shall be exempted from service in any capacity that the President shall declare to be noncombatant." When Mennonite young men with conscientious scruples against war were actually called to training camps, often the first step they took in carrying out their conviction was to refuse to put on the army uniform and to join in drill. They took this stand because they felt that to accept the uniform would lessen their chance of avoiding service in the ranks. Not all of them refused the uniform, however, and also objectors from other groups sometimes refused it. Many Mennonite objectors, perhaps most of them, were convinced that they could not accept any form of service in the military system, not even noncombatant service.

President Wilson did not officially define noncombatant service until March, 1918. In summary his executive order declared service in the Medical Corps, Quartermaster Corps, and Engineering Service to be noncombatant. Objectors were to be classified for convenience into two groups—those certified to be members of religious sects opposed to war, and those not so certified. Men in these classes were to be offered noncombatant service and assignments were to be made to the extent they were able to accept such service without violation of "the religious or other conscientious scruples by them in good faith entertained." Many still refused to accept service in any of the lines now defined as noncombatant, while some did accept hospital service, and a few accepted transport service in France. Those who refused all service in any branch of the army organization were generally segregated in the camps. Some eventually reached prisons and detention camps, some were furloughed to farms and other forms of civilian work. During all the time that the war department was working out plans and methods for handling the objectors who refused all forms of service, some were mistreated and abused by subordinate officers and subjected to ridicule from the regular recruits. Of the Hutterites, whose draftees stood out as a unit against all service, two brothers died from abuse and exposure in prison.

---

[10] Quoted from Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

Complete statistics on the practice of all the young Mennonites drafted during the war are not available it seems. Professor C. H. Smith has summarized what data are at hand on the subject.[11] Perhaps between fifteen hundred and two thousand all told were in camp and overseas. Taking the group as a whole a large majority refused service of any sort; a strong minority accepted noncombatant service with the uniform; a very few entered the regular service. Some observations made on different groups are as follows: The Krimmer Brethren with a membership of nearly a thousand had fifty young men in camp. Twenty-eight of these were conscientious objectors, twenty took noncombatant service, and two entered the regular service. The Central Illinois Conference with a membership of twenty-six hundred reported ninety-six men in the service; of these twenty-six had enlisted, thirty-eight when drafted entered the regular service; twenty-seven were noncombatants, and only five were classed as conscientious objectors who refused all work. Of our own body of Mennonites and of the Amish a large majority refused all service, some did accept noncombatant service as stated before, a few here and there were so loosely attached to the church that they entered the regular service of the army. Among the Russian Mennonites in the West, both the General Conference and the Bruedergemeinde, perhaps three-fourths of those in Kansas and Oklahoma were of the conscientious objector class, while the remainder took noncombatant service. Barely a dozen among the Russian group throughout the entire west took regular service. On the Pacific Coast and in Minnesota there were a larger number of noncombatants and fewer who refused all service. The Eastern District Conference Mennonites generally accepted noncombatant service, and some took regular service. The Mennonite Brethren in Christ were mostly of the conscientious objector class.

As to why the young men of our own group, represented generally by the Mennonite General Conference, to a large majority stood out against all forms of army service, a few reasons might be mentioned here which evidently figured greatly. In the writer's opinion one was the general attitude of nonconformity to the religious, social, and civic life about them which characterized this group. This group attitude insulated the young men somewhat from the strong currents of the war psychology that were developed, which swept the masses before it. It was a part of their group psychology to think of themselves as different from other

[11] Smith, C. Henry: *The Mennonites,* Berne, Indiana, 1919, pages 290-291.

citizens, they were somewhat used to being misunderstood, misrepresented, and perhaps ridiculed by others, and doubtless this feeling lent courage to many a young man to act upon his knowledge of what was taught by the Scriptures and by his church when others could not stand the pressure of circumstances. I doubt that the young men of this group on the whole had been in any way especially coached or taught in the principle of nonresistance as compared with those of other groups. Many of them in fact had to study the Bible after they faced the test in order to inform themselves as to reasons for taking the stand they did. A second important factor was the definite and united stand which the leadership of their group took against all forms of war service. The influence of the *Gospel Herald* must be recognized here. It not only opposed the acceptance of noncombatant service in the army, but even declared it inconsistent to participate in Red Cross, Y. M. C. A., and Liberty Loan campaigns, and all other campaigns for direct war purposes. On these last forms of participation there was more divided practice. Some felt it to be their duty to contribute funds or purchase Liberty Loan Bonds, while many did so under local pressure, and some again held out firmly against it.

Reference has been made to the varying attitudes which were taken by the Mennonite young men when they reached the training camps. These attitudes may for convenience be classified into three kinds, although in practice there were many gradations between them. First there were those who accepted some assignment to noncombatant service. These felt that, since their opposition to war was based upon the commandment not to kill, their duty to God was fulfilled when they refrained from fighting in the ranks and killing anyone of the enemy. This satisfied their conscience and was in keeping with the practice of Mennonites in some places at other times. In addition to this, many of them probably felt a sincere desire to do something for their country in its time of need. And besides if they took army hospital work, as some did, they believed they were doing a piece of humanitarian work which was in accord with Christ's teaching to minister to the sick and needy.

On the other extreme was that attitude of objectors which was designated as "absolutist". These men refused to obey any orders given by military men. They refused to do any work in camp, such as cleaning up and improving grounds, keeping their own quarters clean, or even preparing their own food. They felt that to obey orders issued by military officials was to acknowledge that the military system had some authority over the individual Christian. War they abhorred as an unmitigated evil and a sin,

and the system that was organized to carry it on was to them wholly evil and wicked. Hence their protest against the system took the form of an absolute refusal to co-operate with it in any way. It needs to be said that most absolutist objectors were political objectors, although some religious objectors also took the absolutist stand.

A third class, and for Mennonite men of our group the most numerous, were those who took an attitude that steered a middle course somewhere between the two attitudes just described. These young men had been brought up with the habit of submitting to authority, so that it seemed all right to them to obey orders from officials that pertained purely to routine details of daily camp life. They at least knew of no reasons for refusing to do such work as preparing their own food and keeping their quarters sanitary. On the other hand they felt that from the way the modern military machine was organized and carried on, they could not do noncombatant service, which kind of service was just as essential to the war from a military standpoint as service in the trenches. Even service in army hospitals, while good and humanitarian in nature, seemed objectionable on several grounds. If they were to work in hospitals, other drafted men would thereby be released for active service in the ranks and furthermore the chief purpose of hospital service was to recondition sick and injured men for further service at the front. As for serving in the making and transporting of war munitions and equipment, this was to them hardly different from service in the ranks, and might easily be open to the further reproach that they were conscientious objectors in order to get jobs that involved less danger to life. It is correct to say that this middle ground position of the conscientious objector was the one generally approved by the official body of this group of Mennonites.

We have noticed in this survey how the application of the principle of nonresistance as it relates to participation in war activities has been different from time to time. In every time of actual test some details of practice have to be worked out on the spot. What may the future have in store for nonresistant people? It is of course impossible to tell so far as details are concerned. We have noticed how in the course of the past few centuries the methods of warfare have changed, especially the change from using small numbers of troops to large and unlimited numbers. There are military experts today who predict that further changes in military practice are coming. They frequently confess that the experiences of the World War proved the use of masses of men on the field a failure and that in the future warfare will be more mechan-

ized and actual operations will be carried on more by highly skilled mechanics. Along with this change they predict too that it is likely that when a large nation goes to war there will be universal conscription and mobilization of men, women, and children, of industry, finance, and in fact of the nation's entire resources, all of which will be organized for the one end of winning the war. How much fact there may be in these predictions and guesses no one knows. But it would not be amiss to speculate a bit at times as to what we as nonresistant Christians should do in case we were all conscripted and ordered, say, to produce food or industrial products, at the direction of a military organization. In what way could we then protest against war, or maintain our testimony against carnal warfare? The whole question is linked up with the problem of what the nonresistant Christian's place and function is in modern society, which is becoming increasingly more closely knit and integrated and compacted in a hundred ways.

THE CHRISTIAN'S RELATION TO THE STATE IN TIME OF WAR

II. Is Alternative Service Desirable and Possible?*

GUY F. HERSHBERGER

I

The question of the Christian's relation to the state is one of the most fundamental questions affecting the doctrine of nonresistance as held by the Mennonite church. It is essential, therefore, that it be considered with care and given an answer, if possible, that is satisfactory, consistent, and Scriptural. The relation of the Christian to the state in time of war is only one phase of a much broader and more fundamental question. It is not merely a question of war and peace as instruments of national policy. It is not only a question of participation in the war activities of the state. It involves more than the question of military or non-military service in time of war. It is rather a question of the relation of the Christian to the state at all times whether in war or in peace. Fundamentally, the question before us is that of the Christian's participation in the use of force, of which warfare is only one among various forms. Obviously, if opposition to war were the only principle involved in the nonresistant position the relation to the state would be somewhat different from what it is when we concede that nonresistance is a faith which teaches that all forms of force with which the state has to do are forbidden to the Christian. The historical position of the Mennonite church corresponds with the latter of these two views, for the church has always believed this to be the true New Testament teaching on the subject.

The social teachings of the New Testament are based on the simple proposition that man should love his neighbor as himself. There is the positive command to deal kindly with one's fellow men in the spirit of love.[1] There is no occasion whatever for the use of force. The outlook is entirely unpolitical. Christ's kingdom

---

* A paper read at the Mennonite Conference on Peace and War, held at Goshen College under the auspices of the Peace Problems Committee of the Mennonite General Conference, February 15 to 17, 1935.

[1] In the Sermon on the Mount.

is not of this world.[2] The early church does not appear to have been a class movement or in any sense connected with a class struggle. Political and economic values were depreciated. The emphasis was on purity of heart, the future life, and judgment. Individual Christians were closely held together with the bonds of Christian fellowship, but social problems beyond this fellowship belonged to the world. In case of distress help was extended, of course, but there was no program of social reform; no struggle against oppression; no democratic levelling process. Jesus practically ignores the state. Paul upholds it as an institution providing justice and order. Christians are to respect it and live as good citizens. But they are not to make use of the state authorities. The state is an institution of the world. The Christian lives apart from it.[3]

Christianity is socially conservative in this that it is not a principle of general revolution. On the other hand it is radical in this that submission stops at the point where the social order infringes on the values of the inner life. It is "modern rationalism alone [which] provides the sphere for a revolutionary principle in theory and practice which will construct society according to the claims of reason".[4] The early church regarded the social order as evil, and incapable of reform. Early Christianity therefore, represented a sharp differentiation between the church and the world.

When we come to the medieval age, however, we find a different situation. By this time there had come to pass an interpenetration of the church and the world. Germanic society and the ethics of the church had met each other half way and the sharp differentiation between church and state so evident in early Christianity no longer existed. During the medieval age, however, there existed certain small, intimate groups of Christians who held themselves aloof from the universal church and maintained that indifference or hostility to the world which characterized the primitive church. These groups are commonly known as the sects. They generally refused to use the law, to take the oath, to exercise dominion over others, or to participate in war. Theirs was not an ascetic emphasis on heroic and vicarious achievement.[5] It was not an opposition, in most cases, to the sense life or the average life of humanity, but simply an opposition to the social institutions of the world. The

---

2 John 18:36.

3 Romans 13; I Corinthians 6:1-7.

4 Troeltsch, Ernst, *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches,* I.

5 This was the emphasis of monasticism which lived a life of virtue vicariously for the mass of Christians within the church who were unable to achieve this high ethical standard. The sects applied the high standards to their entire society.

sects generally emphasized lay religion, personal ethical achievement, religious equality, brotherly love, indifference to the state and the ruling classes, dislike of the law and oath, the ideal of poverty and frugality, direct personal religious relationship, appeal to the primitive church, criticism of the theologians. They always demanded a high standard of moral performance. This made for small groups. But what they lost in the spirit of universalism they made up in intensity of life. This tradition of the sects was carried down from the Montanists and Donatists through the Waldensians to the followers of Wyclif and Huss and also to the Anabaptists.

When we turn to Protestant Christianity in the modern age we find certain new and fresh attempts to solve the eternal problem of living the good life in an evil world. For this problem Lutheranism has found the simplest solution from the viewpoint of social practicability. It is a solution rendered void of social complications by creating a conveyance of two compartments between which the individual divides his time while on his earthly pilgrimage to the promised land. One compartment labeled the Church has an absolute monopoly of the Christian's theological faith. It is also permissible for it to offer some advice for the individual's life and conduct to which, as a Christian, he is presumed to make some response. But here there is no attempt at monopoly. For the Christian must devote some of his time to the other compartment of his conveyance, which is the state; and Lutheranism has seldom quarreled with the state on account of its demands on the life of the individual so long as there is no interference with theological faith and doctrine.

Even though the monk of Wittenberg conceived of the church as a universal institution, the Lutheran church never has taken precedence over the state in the sphere of ethics, due, strangely enough, to Luther's own unworldly standard of personal morality which was based on the New Testament ethic. For when he found it necessary to establish a universal church in order that it might enjoy the protection of the state he saw that the church must necessarily include some persons who would not be able to attain to the high ethical standard of the New Testament and that the church must therefore make some concessions to the worldly state. From this embarrassing dilemma Luther found a convenient and simple escape in his dual morality idea. By this idea the individual becomes a dual personality dividing his services between the church and the state. When in the Church he does as Christians do; when in the world he does whatever it requires. Public morals and social control (except family life) are the concern of the state alone.

Religion and faith are under the care of the church. So, according to the Lutheran ethic, the individual Christian may do whatever the state requires short of renouncing his faith in Christ.

Under such an arrangement Lutheranism has little need for a political or social theory and consequently it has formulated none. It passively accepts the existing social order as of God and makes no attempt at its reformation. Luther did not concern himself with questions regarding the nature of the state or its source of authority, and present-day Lutheranism is little concerned about public affairs. The state is really insignificant as an institution, requiring only obedience of the Christian. No doubt this explains why the Lutherans were loyal to the colonies during the American Revolution. It also explains why they were not among the revolutionary leaders. They simply accepted as a matter of course the program of others. When the Reverend John P. G. Mühlenberg preached his farewell sermon before leaving for service in the revolutionary army he simplified the problem as follows: "In the language of Holy Writ, there is a time for all things. There is a time to preach and a time to fight; and now is the time to fight."[6]

When we turn to Calvinism on the other hand we find a system of theology which is the source of tremendous social power. The doctrine of predestination involves a God of majesty who demands a strict holiness on the part of man. So from the beginning the Calvinist was driven into the work of the world charged with the responsibility of making it a holy society, ordered to the glory of God, under the control of the church. In its political aspect this has meant a state church in which the righteous ruled the ungodly according to Biblical principles. Inasmuch as the great objective was the glorification of God rather than the welfare of mankind the ethical emphasis was on those principles which derived from the decalogue, however, rather than those of the Sermon on the Mount. Calvin's Geneva and Puritan New England are classic examples of this theocratic state-church system. Under such a system there was no room for the two compartments of Lutheranism. The duty to the Church and the duty to the state were integrated into one organic whole and the system swept everything clean before it.

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries Calvinism experienced certain modifications in doctrine but its vital influence in the social and political world was not weakened in the least. This change in doctrine has, however, brought a corresponding shift in emphasis from the decalogue and the glorification of God to the

---

[6] Sweet, W. W., *The Story of Religions in America*, p. 264.

Sermon on the Mount and human welfare. Hence no great social problem arises but the Calvinist churches contribute to its solution whether it be pacifism, humanitarian rights, philanthropy, feminism, or social justice in any form. Now as in the past it is those churches which combine a genius for organization with a Calvinistic moral urge which accomplish the greatest results in social movements.

Now when we direct our attention to the sixteenth century Anabaptists we find a group of religionists who perpetuated the tradition of the medieval sects. Like Calvin they accepted the idea of a holy society dominated by the church under a rigid rule of Biblical principles. But unlike him they refused to integrate the functions of the church and the state. They conceived of the church as voluntary in its nature instead of universal, and completely separated from the state. They partitioned society into two groups, the righteous moving in the sphere of the church, and the wicked moving in the sphere of the world and the state.

Inasmuch as civil government exists primarily for the punishment of evil-doers the Anabaptists had little need for the services of such an institution, their own society being righteous; such government as they did need they could provide for themselves. Furthermore, worldly government involved the use of force which is contrary to the New Testament ethic to which they strictly adhered. It is obvious, therefore, that a religious group founded on these principles must necessarily separate itself from the world in a rather sharp and distinct manner. The Anabaptists represent a protest against the social order in the form of a complete separation and withdrawal from the world. It creates its own social order as a sort of oasis within the wilderness of sin.

This does not mean that the Anabaptists were anarchists as some writers suggest.[7] On the contrary they believed strongly in the need of civil government for the world. But inasmuch as the righteous had no need for its disciplinary function, and since government involved the use of force the Christian could not exercise the power of the magistracy or perform the functions of an officer of the government. Taxes were always cheerfully paid, prayers offered for the magistrates, and the commands of the government were gladly obeyed in so far as they did not conflict with Biblical principles as they interpreted them. But to serve in the army or to participate in the operation of a government based on the use of force was out of the question.

---

[7] Cf. Allen, John W., *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 42.

The Anabaptist scheme of separation is in some respects similar to Luther's dual-personality, two-compartment idea. In fact the conception of the church as a voluntary institution alone makes the difference between the two, although it is a difference with a real distinction. Luther's universal church includes everyone, both saint and sinner, and since he refused to integrate church and state, while giving place to both and leaning strongly on the New Testament ethic in personal religious experience, there had to be two compartments to be used interchangeably by the individual as expediency might require. The Anabaptists simply altered this arrangement by partitioning society and confining the righteous strictly to one compartment and the unrighteous to the other. This is the most logical arrangement for a group which accepts the New Testament ethic, and theoretically it offers the simplest solution.

But however simple the solution may be in theory it often presents profound difficulties when submitted to the test of actual practise. For regardless how unworldly any people may be they must nevertheless live in the world. And the world has a pernicious way of getting over into the compartment of the church while the church finds it equally difficult to keep out of the worldly realm. This troublesome intermingling of the church and the world has been most successfully prevented by those sectarian colonies which have established closed communities and autonomous social organizations. Outstanding illustrations are the Mennonite colonists of South Russia, the Hutterite communities of the American northwest, and the Amana society of Iowa. Apparently, the more radical the sect the less likely it is to experience difficulty in the maintenance of its principles. For peaceable groups which have moved more freely in a mixed society have invariably experienced certain modifications in their manner of life and frequently suffered much pain and anguish in their battle with the encroaching influences of the world.

The best illustration of this fact in modern history is the experience of the Society of Friends, commonly called the Quakers. These people have three lines of heritage, one of which is derived from the Anabaptists and tends to a sharp separation from political relationships. So much did the Anabaptist emphasis on love and brotherly kindness appeal to the Quakers that at times they were on the verge of going completely over to the Mennonite position which declines to participate in the use of force even in the civil affairs of the state. But the Quakers also inherited that rich political tradition common to the heritage of all Englishmen, and it was not so easy for an English yeoman, whose blood was charged with a political yeast from the day of King John and Magna Charta to

that of Cromwell and the commonwealth, to reject the state system, as it was for a pious peasant of Switzerland or Germany who had never enjoyed the taste of political privilege. In addition to this the Quakers inherited a strain of religious mysticism which taught that the spirit of every man is a veritable candle of the Lord. So strong was their faith in this inward light and so great their optimism as to the imminent Christianization of the social order that they believed it their duty to identify themselves with the civil government and to administer the affairs of state on the principles of love, brotherly kindness, and good will. They believed that under such a government all cruel, brutal, and inhumane methods of statecraft would disappear. Greed and selfishness would be eliminated; justice and humanity would prevail; and the result would be a warless society in which a peaceful Christian might act as a governor or magistrate with perfect ease of mind. This is the philosophy which formed the basis of William Penn's "holy experiment" in Pennsylvania which was to be a government as nearly as possible like that before the fall of Adam when man, God's deputy, ruled the world and "there was no need of coercive and compulsive means."[8]

Not many years passed by, however, before Penn found it necessary to appoint an army captain as deputy governor of his province, with the explanation that some one was needed who could be stiff with his neighbors. Soon afterwards he was forced to make some concessions in the way of promises to the British Government to provide for military defenses on the Indian frontier and explained to his questioning brethren that one must be wise as well as innocent and that where walking is impossible creeping is in order.[9] So completely did the militaristic world surround the Pennsylvania Quakers, however, and press in upon them that before the experiment was seventy-five years old many were convinced that even creeping was impossible. During the period of conflict leading to the French and Indian War the Quakers who controlled the Pennsylvania government made so many compromises with militarism that by 1756 the best minds in the society had reached the conclusion that political life and the truly peaceful life were incompatible. Their original optimism regarding the imminent Christianization of the social order was gone and under the leadership of the saintly John Woolman the society sounded a retreat from this mundane sphere of worldly politics. In 1756 numerous Quakers

[8] From William Penn's "Frame of Government in *Pennsylvania Colonial Records,* vol. I, pp. 29-30.

[9] Cf. Janney, Samuel M., *Life of William Penn,* pp. 356, 396-7.

resigned their seats in the assembly and in 1758 the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting issued a declaration against the holding of any civil office which might involve the incumbent in calling men to military service. This notable minute asked disownment for those who continue in public office and was adopted upon recommendation of a special committee of which Woolman was a member.[10]

Clearly, the year 1758 marks a turning point in the Society of Friends which now for the first time in its history forbade its members to hold civil office. This action was taken as a matter of expediency, due to the practical difficulties of the assembly in time of war. But Woolman's journal suggests that his own convictions in this matter lay somewhat deeper than mere expediency. In 1759 he asks whether in civil affairs "narrowness, party interest, respect to outward dignities, names or distinctions among men, do not stain the beauty of those assemblies, and render the case doubtful in point of duty, whether a disciple of Christ ought to attend as a member united to the body or not."[11] There appears to be nothing legalistic about Woolman's position. He does not declare that civil government, or even the use of force, is forbidden to the Christian. But he does express an honest doubt as to the compatibility of Christianity with the doings of political assemblies. He seems to have reached the conclusion that political activity tends to gnaw at the vitals of the Christian life. Therefore he definitely turned his face to other interests, and with him the Society of Friends entered an era of quietism. There was now a renewed emphasis on inward religion, and the social message of Quakerism found opportunity for expression in the gentler work of philanthropy and social reform.

The holy experiment of William Penn represents the only attempt in history to combine an uncompromising testimony of peace with active political life; and in this respect the experiment must be regarded as a failure, however successful the government of provincial Pennsylvania may have been in other respects. The Quakers learned by hard experience what the Anabaptists had believed in advance, that attachment to the political order even in its civil aspects, eventually proves inconsistent with the New Testament doctrine of peace. For the civil government is based on force which is essentially no different from the force which is exercised by the military. And the Friends found it impossible to engage in the one without becoming involved in the other.

---

10 *Minutes of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends,* vol. II, p. 120.

11 Woolman, John, *Journal* (Gummere edition), p. 228.

II

The general theme of this paper is the nonresistant Christian's relation to the state. The particular theme under consideration is the desirability and the possibility of alternative service in time of war. A portion of this paper has been devoted to an historical study of nonresistance and its relation to the state. The justification for this procedure is the fact that history has a number of definite lessons to teach us on this question: First, the early church not only refused to take part in warfare, but likewise remained completely detached from all the affairs of state. Secondly, the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, and usually the peaceful groups which preceded them, were altogether non-political in their faith and practice. They regarded the exercise of force as employed by the state as strictly forbidden to Christian people. Thirdly, the one example in history of a peaceful people who made a serious attempt to maintain a strict New Testament ethic as to war and peace in connection with active political life is that of the Quakers, and they were forced to give up the attempt as a failure.[12] They found through hard experience that the New Testament teachings on peace are incompatible with those affairs of state which in any sense involve the use of force. Where there is an attempt to combine the two, one or the other must eventually be abandoned. This provides us with a fundamental principle for the relation of the Christian to the state, applicable at all times whether in war or in peace.

Now, with this principle established, we have something of a foundation upon which to build our program for action in a wartime situation. In time of war there are four possible courses which the individual may follow. The first possibility is that of accepting regular military service. This, of course, would constitute a serious violation of the New Testament teachings on peace and so it is out of the question for nonresistant people. It needs no further discussion except to emphasize that in case of a future war the pressure against the nonresistant position promises to become so great that the danger of enlistment in regular service on the part of individuals not well established in the faith will be greatly increased unless the nonresistant people themselves find some means of relieving the pressure by means of an escape into other and legitimate avenues of service.

The second possibility is to accept what is known as non-

[12] This does not mean that the provincial government of Pennsylvania was a failure *as a government*. In many respects it was extraordinarily successful. What it did fail in was the attempt to maintain the New Testament ethic as to war and peace in connection with active political life.

combatant service. During the World War the Wilson administration provided for this type of service and a number, although a minority, of Mennonite young men accepted it. Some were engaged in hospital service within the military cantonments; others were employed in various tasks needful for the care of the buildings, grounds, and equipment of the camps. This type of service was acceptable to some young men because it excused them from direct and actual military service. By this arrangement they would not be called upon actually to take the life of a fellow human being. Furthermore, the argument was frequently offered that in a time when millions of people were suffering no Christian people could stand idly by with folded hands, refusing all kinds of service. Surely there was something which they could do that would be for the welfare of humanity and at the same time not in violation of their conscience. This argument has strength and logic, and it is especially applicable to hospital service. For this reason some Mennonite young men felt constrained to follow this second course of action. Others, unwilling to undergo the unpleasant consequences of refusing all forms of service and yet unable for conscientious reasons to accept direct and actual service, did likewise.

It must be admitted, however, that non-combatant service as interpreted by the war department of the Wilson administration is not satisfactory from the viewpoint of nonresistant Christians. Obviously the military organization of a government must include the service of some persons who are not actually engaged in firing a gun. These persons are performing an essential service, without which the work on the front could not continue. Their task is not one of actual killing; but it is an auxiliary to this task. Hence it is an integral part of the war service. Therefore when the problem is given a careful consideration one is forced to the conclusion that those Mennonite young men who accepted so-called non-combatant service during the World War really accepted military service. They were a part of the military organization. They performed tasks essential to the success of the boys in the trenches. The war was managed by our military department from its headquarters in Washington. Under this department there were regimented vast groups of men some of whom were found in the trenches in France and others in the military cantonments at home. All these put together constituted the army of the United States of America. Some of them were doughboys with machine guns and bayonets in hand. A few were Mennonites doing seemingly harmless tasks about the camps. But all of them put together made up the United States army organized for war purposes. The conclusion is inescapable,

therefore, that these men were not engaged in non-combatant service at all; they were engaged in military service. The Quakers learned by their own experience that it is impossible to be connected in any official way with even the civil government without becoming involved in military responsibilities. If this is true then how much more impossible is it to accept service under the military government without being involved in military responsibilities. Acceptance of so-called non-combatant service, therefore, is rendered entirely unsatisfactory as a possible course of action for conscientious and thinking nonresistant people. Fundamentally, there is no difference between this and the acceptance of regular military service.

A third possible course for nonresistant people in time of war is a simple refusal to accept any kind of service whatever. Under this plan the Mennonite who is asked to enter the service of his country in war time would simply decline, realizing the seriousness of his position but ready to suffer the consequences. In former wars, including the recent World War, many of our young men have followed this course. It is a course which from the nonresistant point of view is logical, just, and honorable. Those who in times past have followed it have often demonstrated a quality of fortitude, of forbearance, and Christian character as truly genuine as that of the greatest saints and martyrs of the Christian church. If at some future time circumstances and duty should again require this course of action, no doubt there are many who would meet the test as nobly as did those of former days. Indeed, this is the only course of action which a nonresistant people can take consistently, unless they themselves provide some other form of service which is consistent and Scriptural and non-military in its relationships, for the performance of which the government will release the conscientious objectors from detention in the camps.

This brings us to the last of the four possible courses of action open to nonresistant Christians in time of war. Or, more correctly, we are now to answer the question, Is a fourth course of action in the form of alternative service possible and desirable? Regular military service and so-called non-combatant service are not desirable, neither are they possible for a consistent and thinking nonresistant people. A simple refusal to accept any form of service at all constitutes a third course of action which is possible and entirely honorable. There are certain good reasons, however, why the Mennonite Church should give some attention to the fourth possible course of action in the form of a strictly non-military service, for her young men to engage in during times of war. The first reason is the fact that a time of war is always a time of suffering

and need. And it is Scriptural as well as in harmony with the teaching and practice of the Mennonite church that men should relieve suffering and need whenever the opportunity presents itself. Therefore, if the opportunity to render such a service should present itself it would simply be doing what we believe to be our duty as Christians. In the second place such a ministry of service and healing if rendered in time of war would be a very fitting example to the nations. Here a group of men would be occupied in doing good, in bringing life and healing to their fellow human beings, while the nations are engaged in the work of destruction and death. This is an opportunity for a true Christian witness which ought not to be overlooked.

The third reason why the Mennonite Church should give some attention to the possibility of alternative service is the fact that the position of nonresistant Christians in time of war promises to become increasingly difficult unless they themselves provide some means to relieve the situation. Since the time of the Napoleonic wars at the opening of the nineteenth century militarism has strengthened its hold on all of the western nations. Previous to this time the armies of Europe were small. During the medieval period active warfare was confined to the feudal and military aristocracy and their retainers, while in early modern times armies were made up of voluntary mercenary soldiers. The problem of actual military service, therefore, was not as serious in the early history of the Mennonite church as it has become since. There were religious persecutions in the early days, to be sure, but this was generally due to their religious and social views as a whole rather than to a refusal to engage in military service. The seventeenth and eighteenth century, however, witnessed an increase in the royal armies of such autocratic monarchs as Louis XIV and Frederick the Great. And then with the coming of Napoleon, Europe was introduced for the first time to what was known as the *levée en masse.* During the nineteenth century this was followed by the development of the Prussian universal service system which was later adopted by all the great European powers except Great Britain. The effect of this has been the direct participation in modern warfare, by the entire population, instead of by merely the aristocratic and professional soldiers. This fact has been of tremendous significance for the Mennonite church. Until the beginning of the nineteenth century the Mennonites, on the whole, maintained their historic anti-war testimony. But with the growth of the universal compulsory military service system the European Mennonites gradually receded from their historical position until by the close of the

century they accepted military service, with few exceptions, in all the European countries save Russia. This experience of the European Mennonites is adequate proof of the difficulty with which the nonresistant faith must be maintained under modern conditions, if indeed, it is maintained at all. During the course of the nineteenth century the forces of nationalism and militarism had grown so strong that the nonresistant testimony was all but lost among the Mennonites of western Europe. So that by the opening of the twentieth century it was only in Russia, the United States and in Canada that the Mennonites enjoyed exemption from military service.

In the United States and Canada the continued enjoyment of this privilege was due to several causes, such as the tradition of religious liberty associated with those countries and their reasonably distant removal from the cross currents of Europe where wars are most likely to arise. In Russia the Mennonites were enjoying privileges extended them by a special arrangement of the eighteenth century. With the increasing militarization of Russia these privileges were rapidly being encroached upon, however, and interestingly enough for our present study, the only exemption from military service which the Russian Mennonites did enjoy was through the avenue of alternative service. With the coming of the World War and the revolution, however, practically all privileges and exemptions for Mennonites in Russia have been wiped out and now there remain only the American countries in which we find any reasonable hope for the perpetuation of the nonresistant testimony. Even here in the United States the outlook is serious enough to warrant grave concern on the part of every intelligent leader in the church.

During the American civil war it was possible to secure exemption from service in the union army by the payment of a fine, and this expedient was resorted to in a large number of cases. In the World War there was no provision for a money payment. The Selective Service Act included a clause recognizing the nonresistant groups, however, and excusing them from direct military service. But it was specifically stated that this should not be interpreted as an exemption from service declared by the President to be noncombatant. It was apparently the intention of the United States Congress, therefore, that conscientious objectors should be obliged to accept some form of service directly under the war department. As pointed out above the distinction between combatant and noncombatant service is a distinction without a real difference and for that reason the provision of the Selective Service Act of 1917 was

unsatisfactory from the point of view of consistent, thinking, nonresistant people. Fortunately for them, however, the administration interpreted the law somewhat liberally and many of those who were found upon examination to be sincere in their objections to both combatant and non-combatant service were respected in their wishes, some being granted farm furloughs, while others were released for work with the Friends Reconstruction Unit in France. Some were sentenced to Leavenworth prison, of course, and others were brutally treated. And yet it seems fair to say that the real conscientious objectors, those who could not accept the so-called non-combatant service, received greater consideration from the government than the provisions of the draft act would have led one to expect.

It is, of course, impossible to predict what the attitude of the United States government will be toward the conscientious objector in case of a future war. But the tendency of certain proposed legislation for the creation of universal draft laws and the general tendency of the government in the direction of centralization and regimentation seem good reasons for believing that in case of a future war the policy of the government will be more rigid than was that of 1917. And if this is true then the lot of the conscientious objector will be made so much harder. No doubt the government will make a great effort to induce all objectors to accept so-called non-combatant service under the direction of the military organization. If exemption from this type of service is made considerably more difficult than in the last war it will probably mean that more nonresistant young men will enter the non-combatant division of the army than was true at that time. Such a result can conceivably be avoided, of course, by a strengthening of spiritual life and by more faithful and diligent teaching of the nonresistant doctrine. On the other hand, the history of the Mennonite Church seems to teach that when the forces of militarism become too strong there is always a danger of compromise. No doubt, if in a future war the government should refuse to grant any form of exemption save that of so-called non-combatant service many young men would accept it and then attempt to ease their conscience with the fiction that they are not engaged in military service.

For this reason the leaders of thought in the Mennonite Church could profitably give some attention to a definite program of alternative service. If in a future war there is any satisfactory provision for exemption from military service it will probably be due to the fact that the nonresistant people themselves devised the plan and succeeded in having it approved by the government. One

LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Seminary Knolls

can be reasonably sure that the government will not spend much time devising such a program for them. Any plan which they may have to offer will likely include only the two alternatives of military service and the prison. On the other hand it is not impossible that if the Mennonite church should perfect a program of strictly non-military service, which would be of undoubted benefit to society, the government could be induced to accept it. If this could be accomplished and a definite understanding arrived at with the government during peace times, then in case of war the plan could be put into operation at once and the problem of the draft would be greatly simplified for all sincere and conscientious objectors to war. Under such a plan it is even conceivable that Mennonite young men would not be required to undergo the trying experiences of military camp life. On the other hand, all such men of military age and subject to the draft would make application to the government in advance for admission to the Mennonite Service Unit, let us say, and then if an investigation found the application to be *bona fide,* the applicant would be granted permission to enter this service without having been summoned to a military camp. Such an arrangement, if possible, would certainly be very desirable from the Mennonite point of view. In the first place, it would provide exemption from military service. Secondly, it would simplify the problem of exemption. Thirdly, it would engage the objectors in a genuine service, which would be legitimate and consistent with their faith. Fourthly, such a plan would give less opportunity for unjust criticism on the part of those who do not share the nonresistant view. Fifthly, such a program of constructive work and brotherly service would serve as an example and a witness to the nations engaged in a work of destruction and a mission of hate. Sixthly, such a program, carefully planned and organized and ready to be put into operation on short notice, because of its constructive character, if presented to the government for its approval in a time of peace, would be more likely to secure the exemption which nonresistant people desire than any other course which they could follow. For these reasons a program of alternative service seems desirable, without question.

Now when we turn to the question of the possibility of such a program we face a practical problem. It is an administrative problem of no mean proportions. It means that some one must find a definite and specific work to be done. It means that some one must create an organization and an administrative set-up which can begin its operations the moment the hour for action arrives. It means that the entire program must be so carefully planned and so well

organized and its objectives so worthwhile that it will meet the approval of the government. For if this approval is not obtained the plan will of course not serve the purpose of providing exemption for our men who are subject to the draft. Obviously, it is impossible in this paper to outline the details for such a program. These can be filled in only with much careful planning, study, and investigation. It should be possible, however, to make a few suggestions in advance.

Earlier in the paper a reference was made to a form of alternative service enjoyed by the Mennonites in Russia prior to the World War. The Russian government at that time had a system of universal military training and service which required all young men to spend certain months each year for a number of years in the army. In lieu of this military service, however, the Mennonites were permitted to spend an equivalent amount of time in the state forestry service. This was a service under the state, to be sure, but it was a civil service entirely non-political and non-military in character, and could therefore be engaged in consistently by a nonresistant people. Incidentally these Russian forestry camps remind one not a little of the present American Civilian Conservation Corps, which the Roosevelt administration has created for the relief of unemployment, of course, but also for such useful purposes as land conservation and restoration, building of artificial lakes and reservoirs of water, planting of forest shelter belts for the preservation of moisture and prevention of drought and other useful purposes. Projects of this kind are full of suggestion for any people interested in a program of alternative service.

In the beginning of such a program of war-time service it is possible that the work engaged in would need to be done in places removed from the zone of fighting. After the war has done its destructive work, however, or even while the destruction is in progress, it is possible that the service could be devoted to a reconstruction of the devastated areas, and to a ministration to the needs of the people of the stricken region. This is exactly the type of work engaged in by the Friends Reconstruction Unit during the World War, and a number of Mennonite young men were enlisted in this work at that time. This would be a very commendable service and as long as it is not attached to the military organization and is devoted solely to the reconstruction of the devastated areas and not to the rehabilitation of the military organization itself, it would be entirely legitimate and consistent for a nonresistant people. Warfare always results in much suffering which continues for a long time after hostilities have ceased. Therefore when such a

proposed service organization once gets into action in a stricken region it will have an opportunity to carry on its work for months and possibly for years after the smoke of battle has cleared away.

It has been the aim of this paper to show the relation of nonresistant Christians to the state in time of peace and in time of war. Since this relation is one of detachment from all functions of statecraft which involve the individual in the use of force it has seemed necessary to emphasize the need for a plan of alternative service in time of war and to suggest some possible lines along which such a plan might be worked out in practice.

THE ELKHART INSTITUTE MOVES TO GOSHEN*

John Umble

The question, Why did the Elkhart Institute become Goshen College, involves four major problems. First, Why did the founders of the Elkhart Institute select a site on Prairie Street? Second, Why did they consider choosing a new location? Third, Why did they leave Elkhart? Fourth, Why is Goshen College located in Parkside, Goshen?

The reasons for the location of a Mennonite school at Elkhart must be considered in connection with the publication activities of Bishop John F. Funk. During the quarter of a century before the founding of the Institute, Funk had been making Elkhart a center for various types of Mennonite church activity. Almost from the first Funk had invited active and talented young men to Elkhart to assist him in his work. Among the first of these were Michael Keagy, a young German writer and translator, and Keagy's brother-in-law, Rev. Daniel Brenneman, from Fairfield county, Ohio. These were followed as the years went on by such well known figures as Martin Wenger, Henry Brenneman, Joseph Sommer, Dr. H. A. Mumaw, J. S. Coffman, the Kolb brothers, A. B., and A. C., John Horsch, M. S. Steiner, and George L. Bender of Tub (now Springs), Pennsylvania.

In consequence of the concentration of this talent in Elkhart that city became the home base of several Mennonite organizations. Here the Mennonite Aid Plan had its origin in 1882. Located in Elkhart was also the office of the Mennonite Evangelizing Board (organized in 1892) later merged with the Mennonite Board of Charitable Homes and Missions to become the Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities. It is easily understood, therefore, why Elkhart should be considered as the logical place for the location of the Mennonite Church school. The most important consideration, no doubt, was the existence of the normal school in Elkhart founded by Dr. H. A. Mumaw several years earlier. As early as 1888 J. F. Funk had advocated the founding of a school for Mennonite young people after a visit to a Quaker school in Pennsylvania.

---

* A paper read at the January, 1935, meeting of the Mennonite Historical Society of Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana.

Dr. Mumaw had made several unsuccessful attempts to found a normal school, one at Nappanee and at least two in Elkhart, before he founded the Elkhart Institute and established it in a rented hall on Main Street in Elkhart. In this last venture he had the encouragement and moral support of Evangelist J. S. Coffman, Preacher Samuel Yoder, Fred Brunk, and Herman Yoder, of Elkhart, J. S. Hartzler and Jonathan Kurtz, of Topeka, and D. J. Johns, of Goshen.

While these individuals never extended financial support to Dr. Mumaw's privately owned Elkhart Institute, they did promise to recommend his school to prospective teachers who desired normal training and also to students who wished to study the commercial branches. The success of his school was at least in part due to their free advertising and active support. One element in the school's success was the Elkhart Institute literary society, an organization composed of residents of Elkhart and the surrounding community both students and non-students. J. S. Coffman was especially interested in Dr. Mumaw's private school, the Elkhart Institute, because in his work as an evangelist he had met many young Mennonites, east and west, who were in danger of losing interest in the Church of their fathers in consequence of having attended various denominational, interdenominational, and undenominational normal schools and colleges. Coffman was an ex-school teacher, as were also J. S. Hartzler and D. J. Johns, and had a profound interest in Mennonite young people. In 1894 when it was thought that the school would serve the young people of the Church better if it were to be organized as a Mennonite institution, Dr. Mumaw consented to share his interest in the school with Coffman, Hartzler and Johns and eight others. The interest that the group had in Dr. Mumaw's privately owned school and Dr. Mumaw's willingness to relinquish ownership to a corporation to be known as the Elkhart Institute Association seem to have been the determining factors in the location of the long and eagerly awaited Mennonite church school in Elkhart. The group donated stock to at least one member of the corporation who felt financially unable to purchase an interest in the school.

In 1895 those interested organized a board of trustees of twelve members, one third of whom were elected each year to serve a term of three years. Although the Elkhart Institute was now known and advertised as a Mennonite school because the trustees were members of the Mennonite Church, it always remained a private institution, owned and operated by a self-controlled, self-perpetuating board. Dr. Mumaw was elected the first president of

the Elkhart Institute Association. Later it was deemed advisable to elect a minister to that office, chiefly, it seems, because that arrangement would make it possible for the representative of the school to travel by rail for half fare, but also because it was hoped that a minister would enjoy greater prestige among the constituency than a layman. John S. Coffman was elected president of the Board to succeed Mumaw. Dr. Mumaw was then elected as secretary of the board. After Mumaw's resignation as secretary a short time afterward, J. S. Hartzler was elected secretary and served for many years.

J. S. Coffman died in 1899 but his life and work made a vital impression on the religious atmosphere of the school and had much to do with the shaping of its policies. He was much concerned about its future, but was very hopeful. Near the close of his life, and while under great stress of mind, he said, "I have no fears for the future of this school as long as we continue to have such a deep spirit of devotion and effective praying among the students and teachers." He had much to do with encouraging the growing missionary spirit that became such a vital force in the early history of the school. It was he who discovered N. E. Byers, of Sterling, Illinois, young college student at Northwestern University, persuaded him to devote his life to Christian education and brought him to the Elkhart Institute as its first Mennonite principal.

Having decided that Elkhart should be the home of the new church school and that a new building should be erected to house it instead of allowing it to continue in its rented quarters on Main Street, some church leaders naturally preferred that it should be near the Prairie Street Mennonite church building so as to be under close surveillance. That both faculty and students would require considerable paternalistic watching was taken for granted from the beginning. The only available site, according to this point of view, was two city lots almost directly across the street from the church.

Aside from the lack of space for expansion, the chief objection to this site was an underground water course that ran under the basement of the new building, flooding it to such an extent when freshets came that it was practically impossible to keep the water out of the furnace pit. Nor did the site have a sewer outlet. Some of the trustees had not seen the site until building operations were well under way. J. S. Hartzler had attended normal school at both Ligonier and Lagrange and, quite naturally, had expected to see the new institute building situated on a hill. He still recalls the utter amazement and deep sinking of the heart with which he first gazed on the foundations of the new building as he came down

the alley past the church when he arrived to take up his duties at the Institute. Instead of the expected hill he saw a deep depression, the foundation walls barely visible above the bank of earth.

Then, too proximity to the church does not seem to have encouraged amicable relations between the congregation and the school. Misunderstanding arose over the simple, unorganized athletic games played for health and exercise by the men students, most of whom were country boys accustomed to hard manual labor. Certain social and literary programs, also, gave rise to criticism. Partly as a result of this friction, the entire student body and several prominent families in the Prairie Street Mennonite congregation seceded, rented a hall on Main Street and conducted Sunday school services there. Later, Sunday school and church services were held in the Institute chapel hall where baptismal services were conducted in May, 1901, by Bishop Daniel Kauffman. Not until a special investigating committee had made some temporary changes in the bishop oversight of the Prairie Street congregation did the two bodies reunite and work together with officers of the Sunday school chosen from both factions.

Meanwhile, in spite of a discouraging local church situation, relations between the school and the city remained very friendly and also between the school and a growing body of influential Mennonite leaders. Mr. Kent, farseeing and public-spirited editor of the *Elkhart Review,* gave the Institute a favorable write-up early in 1900. A year later he proudly pointed out that the two hundred sixty-one students for the year 1900-01 came from Canada, Germany, and fourteen states of the Union. He went on to say that the catalog for 1901-02 to be issued soon would contain a splendid offering of courses to be taught by eleven instructors and four assistants. But he warned his fellow townsmen that the growth of the school would soon necessitate larger buildings and larger campus. He urged his readers to lend the institution "the encouragement not only of sentiment and influence but of substantial support." That the institution had raised an endowment fund of four thousand dollars without receiving one dollar from citizens of Elkhart, put upon the Elkhart Institute, he asserted, the stamp of permanency.

In spite of this glowing account, however, Mr. Kent's article showed his hope that when Elkhart finally established an educational institution of college grade, it would be on wider than denominational lines. He felt that Elkhart's industrial establishments and the new Carnegie library furnished the economic and cultural foundation for a large college or perhaps even a university. Hence,

while Elkhart was proud of the growth of the Institute and stood ready to support a school of college grade, there was disappointment at the narrow denominational organization and set-up.

During these years the Institute was growing rapidly in favor with Mennonite church leaders. In the summer of 1900 two students of the Institute, Jacob Burkhard and Mary Yoder, were appointed missionaries to India. The Mennonite General Conference, held at Sterling, Illinois, in late autumn of the same year, adopted a resolution recommending the Elkhart Institute among other church institutions as worthy of the support and encouragement of Mennonites in general. The investigation committee that had brought in this recommendation was Daniel Kauffman of Missouri, Daniel Johns of Indiana, and Daniel Bender of Pennsylvania. This committee in attempting to carry out its assigned task of investigating all of the institutions of the Church had encountered some difficulties at the Mennonite Publishing Company in Elkhart. All the so-called church institutions at that time being strictly private corporations, some resented being visited by the General Conference committee. The attempted investigation of the publishing business at Elkhart by the General Conference committee seems to have aroused some animosities and antagonisms that aggravated the trouble between the Institute and the Elkhart congregation. It contributed also to the organization of a rival publishing house at Scottdale a few years later.

In spite of the favorable report of the committee, and the adoption of that report by the General Conference, a new investigating committee of three bishops was appointed by the Conference to investigate the Elkhart Institute. This committee, John M. Shenk, Elida, Ohio; Jonathan Kurtz, Topeka, Indiana; and David Burkholder, Nappanee, Indiana, brought in an optimistic report to the next session of General Conference in 1902.

Within, also, the school presented every evidence of steady growth. In the earlier years few students enrolled for more than one or two ten weeks' terms in order to prepare for business or teaching. Most of them were local young people not interested in completing an academic course. Their contribution to the spirit and permanency of the school program was negligible.

But by 1900 a considerable number of students, led by the wise counsel of the principal, Noah E. Byers, were registering for the longer courses, both Bible and college preparatory. Most of the students, enrolled in these courses not primarily vocational but cultural, were Mennonite young people from Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. Their presence on the campus gave a new

impetus to the life and spirit of the school. The extra-curricular activities expanded greatly and were directed more and more by the students. The Y. P. C. A. assumed control of the religious life and work of the school, new literary societies were organized within the school to supplant, in time, the Elkhart Institute literary society composed of both students and non-students. Through the co-operation of Mr. Clark, secretary of the railroad Y. M. C. A. in Elkhart, gymnasium and bathing facilities were afforded to the men students many of whom roomed in homes lacking every modern convenience. Under the direction of Joseph W. Yoder, of Belleville, Pennsylvania, instructor in English, history, and Greek, a modest program of track and field athletics was introduced and a running-track laid out on the vacant lots of the Morehouse Addition. In the fall of 1902 Mr. Clark, secretary of the Elkhart R. R. Y. M. C. A. gave permission to use the bath tubs and physical culture apparatus, formerly used by the Y. M. C. A., in the Albert M. Brubaker barn on Prairie Street. The building was electrically lighted, well heated and ventilated and had city water and sewer connections. Regular classes in "physical culture" were held twice a week with J. E. Hartzler as student director of physical education.

The field work of J. S. Hartzler during this period was an important factor in the growth of the school. He spent week-ends, and such other time as he could spare from his classes, in evangelistic meetings and promotion work of various kinds including solicitation of students and friends. The writer recalls several occasions when Hartzler's return to his office resembled a highly esteemed father's return to his family. Students gathered in the office to shake hands as Hartzler returned after a week's absence wrapped in muffler and overcoat just as the students came upstairs from supper.

In April, 1901, an alumni association was organized, open to all students who had received diplomas for a course of at least two years. I. W. Royer was elected president; A. J. Steiner, vice-president; Mrs. N. E. Byers, corresponding secretary; Samuel Honderich, treasurer. A student reunion was held in 1901 at the home of Bishop Benjamin Gerig, Smithville, Ohio, by instructors, students, and friends who were returning from the Ohio Sunday school conference held in Holmes County. A month later it was necessary to enlarge the dining hall by removing a partition in the basement and vacating the chemical laboratory. During the Special Bible Term in the following January (1902) one hundred fifty students crowded the Institute building and it became evident to the most skeptical that larger quarters would be needed. The enrollment

for the 1902 spring term was nearly seventy-five percent larger than during the corresponding term of the previous year. The low expenses no doubt affected the enrollment. Tuition was advertised at eight dollars for ten weeks, board one dollar and fifty cents per week. The low rate may have been necessary to meet the competition of the Elkhart Normal School, a new institution founded by Dr. Mumaw, which graduated eighteen men and women on May 28, 1902. In June, 1902, so many Commencement visitors flocked to the Institute campus that the Commencement exercises of the Elkhart Institute were held in the Methodist Episcopal church downtown. In anticipation of raising the Institute to the rank of a junior college in September, 1903, the faculty decided that Principal N. E. Byers should spend the year 1902-03 at Harvard to receive the master's degree and to prepare himself for the more advanced work to be offered.

The April (1902) call for the annual meeting of stockholders announced that the enlargement of buildings and grounds and the future location of the school would be considered. The annual board meeting appointed John Blosser, New Stark, Ohio; C. K. Hostetler, business manager of the Institute; D. S. Loucks, Scottdale, Pa.; C. Z. Yoder, Smithville, Ohio; and J. S. Shoemaker, Freeport, Illinois, a committee to "find a location for the erection of larger buildings for the school." Several directors proposed the abandonment of the Elkhart site and the disposal of the property in favor of a plan to build a college in the East and a preparatory school in the West. Several directors favored buying Highland (now McNaughton) Park in Elkhart north of the St. Joseph River. They insisted that "a proposition could be secured in the city of Elkhart which would enable the Board to erect buildings to the value of thirty thousand dollars and have at least fifteen acres for campus."

The Board finally passed a compromise resolution allowing the advocates of the college and preparatory school idea ten weeks to receive bids, select suitable locations for the two schools and raise funds for purchasing sites and erecting buildings. The resolution further provided that, if the two-school proposition did not materialize within the ten weeks, the officers of the board should "secure Highland Park, provided, first, that the Institute property could be disposed of at a fair price, and second, that Highland Park could be purchased for twenty thousand dollars or less, and, third that one hundred lots could be sold at an average price of $425."

Several considerations had led to the selection of Highland Park by the faculty and management of the Elkhart Institute. Parts

of the Morehouse addition were low and wet, actually swampy. The only suitable building site was too near the corner of Prairie Street and Indiana Avenue. And the flooded basement of the Institute led the Board to seek higher ground. In the second place J. S. Hartzler and others preferred a church organization for the faculty and students separate from the Prairie Street congregation. As soon as the school authorities had determined that prominent church leaders, Bishop Daniel Kauffman, Bishop D. J. Johns, Bishop Jonathan Kurtz, Bishop J. S. Shoemaker, Bishop David Burkholder, and others would countenance the organization of a separate congregation in North Elkhart, a Prairie Street site for the future expansion of the Elkhart Institute received scant consideration.

When the church and school leaders decided to leave Prairie Street, only a small minority considered any other location than Highland Park, north of the St. Joseph River and west of the North Main Street bridge. The site preferred by the Institute organization lay up the hill near the present artesian well. It was ideal in many respects: high elevation, proximity to an abundant water supply, and a considerable area that could be laid out in building lots. The last was indispensable because the plan of the board of trustees called for the purchase of a tract which, when divided into lots, could be sold for a sufficient amount to provide a fund for the erection of the necessary new buildings.

So certain were students and faculty that Highland Park would be chosen as the future site of the Elkhart Institute that a visit to that part of the city was included in the regular program of commencement events in 1902. Alumni and friends were ready to congratulate the Institute management on the beauty and suitability of the future location of the school.

Highland Park, however, had one serious drawback. The owners demanded an exorbitant price because they felt certain that the Board of Trustees could find no other acceptable location, especially since the required number of lots (100) had already been subscribed. They reasoned also that the site for the church school must be chosen near the church publishing house.

When it became apparent that the city of Elkhart and the owners of Highland Park were merely playing a waiting game in the conviction that the need for more room at the Institute would force the Board to purchase the new site at the owners' figures, members of the Board, half in earnest and half in an attempt to frighten Elkhart with the prospect of losing the school, began to entertain offers from various sections of the East and Middle West.

As early as May 1, 1902, the General Assembly of the state of Ohio passed a bill permitting the sale of certain property at Wadsworth, Ohio, to induce the Elkhart Institute to move to the site formerly occupied by the Central Mennonite College. On May 16, C. K. Hostetler was in Goshen inspecting possible sites for the location of the school, particularly the Walnut Hill property on North Main Street now occupied in part by the John Abshire residence. He also visited Burns Park, the forested area east of Violet cemetery and north of Waterford. On June 14 at the annual meeting of the trustees of the Elkhart Institute Association the "committee on location reported on the following places: Wadsworth, Ohio; Hollidaysburg, Pa.; Burns Park, near Goshen, Indiana; Highland Park, Elkhart, Indiana. Highland Park being the most feasible, was discussed most."

At the June meeting "on motion John Blosser was elected chairman of the committee on location with power to appoint four other Board members to serve on the same committee. He appointed D. S. Loucks, C. Z. Yoder, C. K. Hostetler, and J. S. Shoemaker," as already pointed out above. During the summer of 1902 Principal N. E. Byers and others visited various communities in Illinois, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Ohio, that offered more or less tangible inducements. The question of the future location of the Institute became one of the major features of the publicity campaign that resulted in a greatly increased enrollment in September, 1902.

Most of the trustees, however, were Indiana men and thought in terms of Indiana as a future location of the Institute. Elkhart Institute instructors, too, had come to think of Elkhart as the logical place for the church school. The city offered decided advantages for young people to earn part of their expenses, supported an excellent lecture course, had been recently granted a fine Carnegie Library, and had a large number of public-spirited citizens interested in music, art, and general culture. It is doubtful, therefore whether either trustees or administrative officers seriously considered leaving Elkhart. Throughout the summer, however, they were becoming more and more impatient with the mercenary attitude of the Highland park board and they decided at length that, if the attitude of the park board did not change by September 1, something must be done.

Accordingly on September 8, 1902, Principal N. E. Byers and C. K. Hostetler, business manager, visited Goshen to inspect some of the real estate that leading citizens of Goshen considered an ideal location for the Institute. A few days later the *Elkhart Daily*

News said editorially: "Goshen has made a proposition to the Elkhart Institute. It is now up to the Highland Park Association and Elkhart City to secure that institution. If the city will buy the present site of the school or agree to do it in a year, the location will be consummated. The site is needed for a south side grammar school, and it seems to us that the proposition is a business one devoid of all sentimental desire for the city's growth. But in addition to the business feature is the use of Highland Park for an ideal purpose, the site of an educational institution of growing value and reputation."

Little evidence is at hand to indicate that when Principal N. E. Byers left for Harvard in the fall of 1902, any site but Highland Park received serious consideration. The *Institute Monthly* for September 1902 stated editorially that "no further steps would be taken in the matter of relocation until the proposition made at Elkhart had been disposed of." But negotiations had progressed far enough so that it had become certain that some proposition which the Institute could accept would be made when the time came. In January 1903 J. S. Shoemaker and C. K. Hostetler looked over the location in Parkside, Goshen, and made a favorable report to the committee on location. That report had much to do in turning the tide in favor of Goshen. George W. Selby, of South Bend, Indiana, a recognized authority on school architecture made preliminary plans for a new building for the Elkhart Institute early in November.

In October several of the officers of the Executive Board of the Institute had a meeting with Mr. E. C. Bickel, relative to the purchase of Highland Park. No definite conclusions were reached, however, and the future location of the Institute was left undecided. But the Board realized that the increased attendance had brought them face to face with the need for larger buildings, better equipment, more extended courses of study and, consequently, more financial support and a larger endowment fund.

When it seemed likely that the price asked for Highland Park in Elkhart would prove prohibitive, J. S. Hartzler and C. K. Hostetler considered attempting to acquire a site on the elevation lying east of the Yellow Creek bridge on the left (north) side of the highway running from Elkhart to Goshen. Two disadvantages led to the abandonment of that site: it was too far from Elkhart for students who would be doing part-time jobs in Elkhart for partial self-support; sewage disposal offered serious difficulties because it was feared that using Yellow Creek as a sewer outlet might pollute the stream and invite litigation.

Meanwhile several Goshen citizens began to make a serious bid for the location of the Institute in that city and cultivated friendly relations with the school to that end. The Hon. A. S. Zook, attorney-at-law, of Goshen, Republican mayoralty candidate, delivered the opening address of the second term of the school year 1902-03. Finally a group of wide-awake Goshen business men inquired what inducements would lead the Elkhart Institute Association to move the school to Goshen. The reply was that if Goshen would raise ten thousand dollars the Institute would be relocated in Goshen.

In March, 1903, the future location of the school seemed no nearer settlement. On March 28, C. K. Hostetler, business manager, and J. S. Hartzler, secretary, visited Goshen and inspected four sites: The Wilden property on North Main Street; the former home of Daniel D. Ullery west of the Elkhart river in what is now the Riverside addition; land in Parkside and on the Shoup farm south of the city; and the residence property of City Judge J. M. Peters on Crescent Street. No definite action was taken but the *Goshen Daily News Times* announced a meeting of the Commercial Exchange that evening to discuss the proposition.

Two days later the *Elkhart Review* stated editorially that "the statements in the Wakarusa and Bristol papers that the Elkhart Institute is to remove to Goshen have no more basis than that Goshen is making an offer. Elkhart is not asleep and will not let the Institute move from her borders." Elkhart may not have been asleep, but Goshen certainly was wide awake. A meeting of the Commercial Exchange of Goshen on April 3, 1903, was poorly attended because a severe storm came up at that hour. But Wilbur L. Stonex and others refused to be discouraged. Meeting after meeting was held to interest influential citizens of Goshen to bring the school to Goshen.

The plans drawn up to interest Goshen citizens seem to have called for fifteen acres of ground with seven new buildings, a large gymnasium and athletic field, and later an agricultural branch. But the proposition finally made to the Commercial Exchange of Goshen by the administrative officials of the Institute was that, if Goshen would raise $10,000, the amount estimated as necessary to secure the college site, the college management would erect a main college building at once to cost $25,000. As an added inducement it was pointed out that fourteen or fifteen new homes would be built at once also and that the college would add as much to a city's population as a good industry.

Before the end of April three Goshen citizens had subscribed

$1500. The Commercial Exchange had held several meetings and Anthony Deahl, president of the organization, called a special meeting for the evening of May 1. At that time three representatives of the Institute were present to explain the school's needs, its aims, the scope of its work and to answer all questions. The Commercial Exchange decided to raise most of the $10,000 by popular subscription and to emphasize small contributions. In the campaign both economic and cultural advantages were pointed out. Solicitors insisted that the college would be equivalent to a factory employing eighty hands at average wages because it would invite two hundred students who would bring an average of two hundred dollars each to the city. They pointed out that a college would increase the population of the city by five hundred in two years, that the location of the school in Goshen would bring a large number of families, people who desired educational advantages for their children. The Exchange called attention to the educational and moral advantages of such a college as shown by the fact that the small colleges of the country send out some of the strongest graduates.

Elkhart at last perceived that the Institute was slipping away. During the years 1900 to 1903 the *Elkhart Daily Review* had been urging Elkhart citizens to meet the reasonable demands of the Institute to make sure that the school would remain there. The *Review* had refused absolutely to believe that the Trustees of the Institute had the slightest intention of removing the school to another city. Even so late as March 28, as already stated, the *Elkhart Review* proclaimed editorially that Elkhart would not let the Institute move from her borders. But relations between the Institute authorities and certain influential business men of Elkhart were becoming strained. Elkhart resented being threatened with the loss of the school. They refused to consider Goshen a serious rival and resorted to ridicule of the smaller city. The tactics employed by the Highland Park Association were particularly unfortunate because unconsciously or unintentionally they played directly into the hands of the Commercial Exchange of Goshen.

When the Goshen Exchange announced a meeting for May 1 to discuss the proposition with representatives of the Institute, the *Review* became alarmed. In a long editorial printed on that day the *Review* gave seven reasons why Elkhart citizens should take active steps to retain the institution: Goshen is making a positive effort to secure the school. The Elkhart Institute has added distinctly to the educational atmosphere of the community. It brings and keeps in Elkhart usually an average of five hundred to seven hundred strangers and new residents. The readiness of the stu-

dents to follow honorable callings in order to pay their way through school has added to the productiveness of the community, and has relieved the stress of the domestic problem. The school would purchase Highland Park. The school city needs the Elkhart Institute building for a south side grammar school. It is sheer folly to let the Institute go when it costs so little to keep it and when Elkhart is eager to secure institutions that add to its prosperity and character.

But it was too late. The *Goshen Daily News Times* reprinted the editorial to fan the glowing flame of enthusiasm kindled in the county seat. At an enthusiastic mass meeting of Goshen citizens on May 5 with Attorney Anthony Deahl, president of the Commercial Exchange presiding, the following committee was appointed to solicit funds: W. L. Stonex, chairman; John F. Scott, James S. Drake, A. S. Zook, D. A. Saunders, H. H. Gortner, Frank Kelly, Dwight H. Hawks, Chas. A. Davis, V. W. B. Hedgepeth, Daniel Kauffman, and Charles Shoup. W. L. Stonex urged that, since this was Goshen's first opportunity to secure a college, it must not be neglected. V. W. B. Hedgepeth, superintendent of Goshen city schools, pointed out that the proposed college and elementary teacher training school would provide two teachers or more for elementary pupils. This would mean a saving to the city in teacher hire and would postpone the necessity of providing an additional building for the elementary pupils of the south part of Goshen. With the whole Mennonite church back of the school, it would be sure to prosper and would bring at least twenty families to Goshen as permanent residents. Anthony Deahl asserted that he would be willing to give more to secure a college than a factory regardless of the size of the latter.

C. K. Hostetler, now of Youngstown, Ohio, writes in regard to one of the early meetings, possibly of May 5, reported in such glowing language in the Wednesday, May 6, issue of the *Goshen Daily News Times*: "Goshen would not have succeeded in getting the school if it had not been for the foresight, dynamic energy and tireless activity of W. L. Stonex. At the first meeting called by the Commercial Exchange of Goshen three people were present. In spite of this discouraging outlook, Mr. Stonex went ahead, appointed a committee to raise the funds, published the same in the papers, and personally secured the largest donations." It is possible that the three men attending this meeting were Stonex, Deahl, and Hedgepeth, mentioned above.

In a few days after the May 5 meeting subscription blanks were printed. Sub-committees circulated them among the various

groups in the city: business men, manufacturing interests, professional men, the school interests, including the teachers, the county officials, the wealthy ladies of the city, and the citizenship generally. By May 9 John F. Scott, of Parkside, had exceeded his quota of three thousand dollars. The Indiana and the Fort Wayne and Goshen interurban railways subscribed one thousand dollars each. Two Goshen citizens who had children that would be ready for college in a few years promised one hundred dollars each.

Seven thousand dollars had been subscribed by May 13. On that date seven members of the Board of Trustees of the Elkhart Institute met in Goshen to consider plans and specifications for a new building to cost twenty-five thousand dollars. On May 15 the Commercial Exchange of Goshen notified the Institute that the ten thousand dollars had been subscribed. On that day the *Elkhart Review* said editorially: "Goshen is not to be chided for securing this institution but Elkhart has allowed it to slip away without counting the cost of the loss. The time will come when Elkhart will feel the results of inactivity and apathy in this matter. Materially as well as otherwise the loss is to be deplored."

Even after the Institute was pledged to Goshen, E. C. Bickel and others of the Highland Park Association attempted to break up the agreement. Goshen could not raise the money, they asserted. "Goshen?" they sneered, "Well, if you go to Goshen you will be located in a delightfully quiet town, but if you had decided to go on down to New Paris or Waterford it would have been still more quiet!" There appears to be little doubt that the loss of the Institute to Elkhart must be attributed to the tactlessness of Elkhart real estate men no less than to their greediness and ill-timed parsimony. The price asked for Highland Park was quite unreasonable. When accused by Elkhart real estate men of having left Elkhart without giving due consideration to the advantages offered by Elkhart, the Institute authorities replied with considerable truth that Elkhart had offered nothing except to sell real estate to the Elkhart Institute Association at an exorbitant figure. No doubt there were extenuating circumstances. Elkhart business men and Elkhart banks were seriously affected by the $120,000 bankruptcy of contractor Frank M. Brumbaugh on April 20, 1903. Before the end of the year Elkhart business suffered another blow in the failure of the Indiana National Bank. The money for building the new Goshen College was withdrawn from that bank a scant week before the crash and deposited in the City National Bank of Goshen. If this money had not been withdrawn, the college could not

have been built in the summer of 1903—perhaps not at all in Goshen.

After being notified on May 15 that Goshen had raised ten thousand dollars, the Institute authorities moved rapidly. J. S. Hartzler canvassed the eastern part of Elkhart county and the territory south of Topeka tentatively selling building lots to finance the land purchase and preliminary expenses of building operations. By May 20 he had sold twenty-three lots, but when a "final meeting" of the Commercial Exchange was called to close the matter, the Exchange was forced to admit that it did not have ten thousand dollars in bona fide subscriptions. The Institute authorities refused to go on until the entire amount was guaranteed. On May 22 the *Goshen Daily News Times* explained the whole situation to the people of Goshen and insisted that the "project should not fail at this time because of the lethargy or indifference of persons who are able to and should see that the remaining amount needed is pledged." The *News-Times* pointed out that Wilbur Stonex and others in Parkside had given five thousand dollars and urged the remaining interests in the city to contribute their proportional share.

J. S. Hartzler and C. K. Hostetler finally signed the contract on May 27, 1903. The city agreed to give the Elkhart Institute Association ten thousand dollars in three equal installments. The agreement stipulated that the proposed college should be known as Goshen College. The association agreed to erect a building at a cost of twenty-five thousand dollars and to purchase eight acres of Mrs. Shoup south of Prairie Avenue (now College Avenue), the Interurban Land company's tract in Parkside and Jacob Obrecht's eight acres on the east side of Eighth Street just north of Parkside. These tracts included the present campus, lots on both sides of Lafayette Avenue west of Main Street and city lots as far north as Jackson Street.

During the negotiations with Goshen citizens several sites in Goshen had been considered. The Walnut Hill property on North Main Street was sold for the erection of a private residence before plans for moving to Goshen were completed. Burns Park, north of Waterford, was considered too far from the city and from the city street car line at the end of South Main Street. It was argued that Wilden Hill on East Lincoln Avenue would be ideal on account of the excellent view overlooking the city and its proximity to the two railroad depots at the junction of East Lincoln Avenue and South Ninth Street. The latter was an important consideration in the horse and buggy era. But J. S. Hartzler feared that Mennonites could not be interested in purchasing building lots where the soil was too sandy to sustain a thrifty growth of vegetation.

The Daniel D. Ullery farm west of the Elkhart River near the bag factory seemed ideal in many respects. A large barn on the property could be transformed into a gymnasium at a minimum of expense, it was thought, and the land appeared suitable to be laid out in building lots. The deciding factor against this choice was its distance from the city and its situation across the river. The latter, especially, was considered as preventing this site from ever becoming a desirable residence section.

The location finally chosen, the present site of Goshen College, had been carefully examined again and again. It, too, was somewhat sandy, was treeless, and was not a scenic spot. But it lay on a slight elevation, was at the end of the city car line, was only a few minutes walk from the river, and was adjacent to a section of the city where desirable building sites for future homes were already selling at a good figure. The land purchase included ten acres of land and one hundred forty building lots.

The last issue of the *Institute Monthly,* published in May, 1903, announced that the Institute would be moved to Goshen. The first issue of the *Goshen College Record,* published in a combined June and July number, 1903, stated: "Goshen College needs $30,000 at once for new buildings and equipment. This amount will be partly met by the sale of lots and partly by the City of Goshen. George W. Selby, architect, of South Bend, furnished complete plans and specifications for a main building and a dormitory to cost about $30,000."

On June 12, appropriate ground-breaking ceremonies were held in a wheat field south of Goshen on the present site of the Administration Building of Goshen College. Two street cars were chartered to convey faculty, students, and commencement visitors to the exercises. A temporary stage for the speakers was erected in the center of the site of the proposed first new building. Stakes were driven to show the outlines of the structure, one hundred and four feet by seventy-two feet, and the wheat was cut away from this space. Secretary J. S. Hartzler presided at the exercises. The Rev. Dr. Hervey L. Vannuys, who had just resigned after a fifty-year pastorate of the First Presbyterian church of Goshen, been chosen pastor emeritus, elected moderator of the Ft. Wayne Presbytery and ministerial delegate to the Los Angeles General Assembly in May, delivered the dedicatory prayer. Attorney Anthony Deahl, president of the Commercial Exchange, spoke on behalf of the City, and Professor C. Henry Smith, then a student at Chicago University, responded in behalf of the school. John Blosser of New Stark, Ohio, president of the board of trustees of the Elkhart

Institute Association spoke for the board and J. S. Hartzler, secretary of the board and a member of the faculty, made a few remarks on behalf of the students and faculty. The Sunshine Male Chorus, directed by Professor W. K. Jacobs, sang several selections. The ground was then broken outlining the new building, J. S. Hartzler holding the plow handles and the team of C. P. Yoder, member of the board of trustees, drawing the plow.

Even before the date of the ground-breaking exercises the rapid sale of building lots in the new Goshen College addition gave evidence of the popularity of the choice of location. Nearly forty lots had been sold by July 1 at prices ranging from two hundred to five hundred and twenty-five dollars. Several purchasers bought two lots and one individual purchased four. C. K. Hostetler acquired title to the W. L. Stonex property at the northwest corner of Lafayette and South Eighth. N. E. Byers, J. S. Hartzler, Mrs. J. S. Yoder (mother of Attorney J. S. Yoder), A. R. Zook (father of the late Mrs. I. R. Detweiler), Joseph Smoker (father of the late Mrs. E. K. Greenwalt), Sarah Yoder (widow of Herman Yoder), Henry H. Rutt, Tena Beachy (Mrs. Peter Unzicker), Lavona Berkey (Mrs. F. S. Ebersole), Anna H. Kauffman (Mrs. A. M. Hess), E. J. Zook, J. M. Hartzler, Celesta Hartzler, Jacob Mast, John O. Martin, Elizabeth Buzzard, C. P. Yoder, Abram P. Huber, S. F. Gingerich, George W. Selby, Lydia Kriegbaum, Mrs. S. Hartzler, Rudy Senger, D. Detweiler and the *Goshen News-Times* were among the early purchasers of lots on Eighth Street. Most of the buyers were not merely investors, but were prospective home-builders. Before the middle of July several new houses were under construction. Rudy Senger, a student, built his nine-room house during the summer vacation. In 1904 Mrs. J. S. Yoder moved from Smithville, Ohio, and built the two dwellings now occupied by Dr. Van der Bogart and the Leander Weldy family. President N. E. Byers and family occupied the latter.

During the preceding summer (1903) the new campus was a busy scene of activity. Few, even of the most ardent friends of the College, were optimistic enough to believe that a five thousand dollar dormitory and a twenty-five thousand dollar administration building could be pushed to completion in time for school to open in the fall. But the opening date was set back to September 28, and Secretary J. S. Hartzler insisted that the buildings would be ready. Plans called for the early completion of the dormitory so that, if necessary, recitations could be held there until the main building was partly finished. As fast as a recitation room in the

main building was finished Secretary Hartzler planned to conduct classes there.

The dormitory, intended eventually to house thirty-four women, sprang up in six weeks and was practically completed by September 1. Excavation for the main building began on June 23. The *College Record* for August, 1903, credits C. K. Hostetler with taking the first shovelful of dirt out of the basement. Jesse Smucker hauled out the first load. Between June 23 and August 1, twelve to twenty-two men were at work on the buildings. The long timbers for the main building were shipped from Michigan, and the sawed stone from Bedford in southern Indiana. The foundations of both buildings were made entirely of concrete. These were the first concrete foundations ever put under a large building in the city of Goshen. When, on August 1, the foundation walls of the main building were completed, the president of the Commercial Exchange of Goshen published a notice asking for the payment of one-third of the ten thousand dollars subscribed by Goshen citizens. During the six weeks preceding August 1 Secretary J. S. Hartzler did work as carpenter, mason, brick-layer, hod-carrier, architect, contractor, and superintendent. While he was not busy with one or more of these responsibilities, he shoveled dirt and kept the time of the men who were employed. One of his most disappointing experiences was with a foreman who was unable to keep sober until the job was completed. After this foreman had abused "a second chance," Secretary Hartzler promptly dismissed him.

Meanwhile the Institute property on Prairie Street, Elkhart, was sold to the Mennonite Brethren in Christ for six thousand dollars, the price originally asked of the city of Elkhart. The Mennonite Brethren organized a Bible training school with Elder Daniel Brenneman, of Goshen, president, and J. J. Hostetler, secretary. The agreement specified that they should get possession on October 1. The purchase price included the piano and organ, all chapel, kitchen, and dining room furniture, student desks, and similar equipment. The other furniture was moved to Goshen as soon as room could be found for it in the new buildings.

In spite of Secretary Hartzler's long hours spent in strenuous working and efficient planning, delayed brick shipments and labor difficulties such as mentioned above, prevented the completion of the buildings in time for opening. When students and instructors began to arrive, the walls of the administration building were laid only to the top of the first floor. The first delegation of students from Ohio, arriving on Monday evening, September 28, found the President, Secretary, and Business Manager carrying boards out

of the dining room in the basement of the dormitory and cleaning up the blocks and shavings left by the carpenters. For several months men students who wished to work were employed on the new buildings on Saturday.

The first term of Goshen College opened with an enrollment of seventy-seven regular students. Several others registered for special work in music and elocution. The strong religious emphasis of the Elkhart Institute was continued from the first at Goshen College. The first Devotional Meeting was held on Thursday, October 1, at 4:35 p. m. The subject was "Daily Devotional Bible Study." Chapel exercises were held every morning in the recitation rooms in the Dormitory, college students meeting in one room and academy, normal and Bible students in another. President Byers delivered his inaugural address in the Christian Church on Main Street on Tuesday, September 29.

J. M. Kurtz was placed in charge of the dining hall accommodating about fifty regular boarders. While the main building was being completed six of the rooms on the first floor of the dormitory were used for recitation purposes. The second floor was used as a dormitory and occupied by a part of the women students. Laundry, dining hall, and kitchen were in the basement.

Contrary to expectations and advance announcements no classes could be held in the main building. There, bricklayers, carpenters, mortar mixers and helpers were still at work. On Saturdays the men students helped on the building to such an extent that a visitor was reminded of the Tuskegee Industrial Institute. The outside walls of the main building were almost completed on October 15, plumbers were installing the heating plant and gas pipes, and part of the basement was lathed ready for plastering, but no actual plastering was done in the main building until November 5. By December 15 the steam heating plant was in operation and with the dormitory and part of the administration building connected was giving excellent satisfaction. Finishing work by the carpenters was under way, but the floors had not been laid.

The beginning of the winter term on January 5 brought fifty-eight new students. Hence it was absolutely necessary to hold recitations in the main building. Bishop John Blosser president of the Board of Trustees, delivered the opening address for the Special Bible term on January 5, probably in the new Assembly Hall. On the same day President N. E. Byers delivered the opening address on the subject, "Unity of Life." The first recitations were held in the Administration Building on January 6, and the first devotional meeting in the new Chapel Hall, as it was then called, at 4:35 p. m.

on January 7. During all this time the carpenters were rushing the work on the new building making such a din that it was almost impossible to conduct the necessary recitations.

On the next evening, January 8, the new building was formally dedicated with appropriate exercises. All the preceding day students helped clean, sweep, dust, and carry out litter of every description. During the dedicatory exercises every bit of available space was occupied on the main floor, in the gallery, and wings. Many people stood throughout the entire program and some were unable to gain admission. The principal address of the evening was delivered by Professor Amos W. Patten, A.M., D.D., of the department of Biblical instruction in the college of liberal arts at Northwestern University. S. G. Shetler, of Davidsville, Pa., one of the instructors in the special Bible course then gave a brief address. The program opened with a number by the Sunshine Male Chorus under the direction of Professor W. K. Jacobs. The ladies' chorus under the direction of Professor C. Henry Smith rendered Brewer's "Winter Song" and the combined choruses sang the "Hallelujah Chorus" under the direction of Professor Jacobs.

The entire building was lighted and open to inspection that evening, but none of the rooms on the third floor and in the basement were completed. Stairways were still unfinished. The carpenters did not finally gather up their tools and leave the building until January 30 exactly seven months after they began their work. During January the din was many times terrific seriously interfering with class room procedure.

Meanwhile the state of the campus can be better imagined than described. At first when students arrived in the fall, boards were thrown loosely about for walks. These slid about underfoot in the mud causing more than one student unexpectedly to set foot in a puddle. Later a board walk was built from Eighth Street to the buildings. Grading of the campus began early in the spring of 1904 under the superintendency of Jacob Mast. While that work was going on, some far-seeing member of the Adelphian Literary Society conceived the idea of placing a fountain in front of the Administration building. The sidewalks and the basin for the fountain were completed in May. The fountain was erected on May 16 at a cost reported to have been sixty dollars and formally presented to the College on Wednesday of Commencement week, J. E. Hartzler making the speech of presentation and President Byers accepting for the College June 22, 1904. Early in May, John O. Martin, donated a load of thrifty young trees to the Col-

lege and, after he had unloaded them, took off his coat and helped to plant them.

The members of the Aurora Literary Society were considerably dismayed at being behind the Adelphians in a gift to the College. Several meetings were held during Commencement Week, 1904, and finally one alumnus offered to head a subscription list with thirty dollars provided the Aurora Society would erect an entrance to the campus at the foot of Eighth Street. Due largely to the enterprise of J. Frank Ebersole, of North Tonawanda, New York, the work was completed at a cost of four hundred and thirty dollars and presented to the College on June 19, 1905. The same alumnus who headed the subscription list made the presentation speech and President Byers accepted for the College.

One year later, in March, 1906, a movement was launched to build a new women's dormitory. Faculty and former students promised two thousand dollars, present students two thousand dollars, and the Board of Trustees twenty-one thousand dollars. Lewis Kulp was the largest donor and in June Kulp Hall was under way. When Kulp Hall became the new women's dormitory, East Hall became a men's dormitory. The next building was Science Hall erected in 1915. East Hall then was moved from its awkward position in the enlarged campus to its present location where it became the College Apartments after Coffman Hall was built for the men.

A discussion of the early history of the college would not be complete without reference to the college motto. The phrase "Culture for Service" seems to have been spoken first by President Byers on September 29, 1904, as the closing words of his inaugural address as president of Goshen College. The Board of Trustees authorized the faculty to decide on a motto and seal. And in April, 1904, "Culture for Service" was announced officially as the motto of Goshen College.

A closing word in regard to the organization of the College congregation would seem to be in order. From the first a strong religious spirit was in evidence. As an undergraduate N. E. Byers had been profoundly interested in personal religion and had become a volunteer for foreign missions. Several of his relatives were early workers in the Mennonite Home Mission in Chicago, the first organized mission effort in the Mennonite church. When Evangelist J. S. Coffman tried to persuade Byers to give up his foreign missionary convictions to become principal of the Elkhart Institute, one of his arguments was that Byers could forward the work of the Church more by training missionaries for the foreign

field than by going himself. And this was one of the main factors in Byers' decision to remain at the home base. In 1901 Jacob Burkhard, of Roseland, Nebraska, and Mary Yoder, of West Liberty, Ohio, were the first students from the Elkhart Institute to go to India. I. R. Detweiler, of Hastings, Nebraska, and Bertha Zook of Topeka, Indiana, sailed for India in 1902. During these years the Executive Committee of the Mennonite Mission Board met at the Institute several times to examine students who were volunteers for the foreign field.

In the early days at Elkhart most of the faculty members and students of the Institute who were members of the church constituency were members of Amish Mennonite congregations: but, since no Amish Mennonite church was located in Elkhart, instructors and students were expected to transfer their membership to the Mennonite congregation on Prairie Street. When the school moved to Goshen, a new problem arose. There was neither Mennonite nor Amish Mennonite congregation in Goshen. The College had more friends among the Amish Mennonites of Illinois, Ohio, and Indiana than it did among the Mennonites. Should the new congregation be Mennonite or Amish Mennonite or a union of both? If the latter, who should have bishop oversight of the congregation?

Before the College buildings were ready to accommodate church services, the congregation met in the Christian Church on South Main Street for preaching services and Young People's Meeting. The Christian Church pastorate was vacant and the two congregations met together with J. S. Hartzler in charge of preaching services. With the usual aggressiveness of Mennonite conferences, the autumn meeting of the Mennonite conference of Indiana and Michigan authorized the organization of a Mennonite congregation in Goshen. This organization was effected on Sunday evening November 8, by Bishop Jacob P. Miller. J. S. Hartzler was placed in charge of the congregation. In reporting this organization the *Goshen College Record* adds: "All students of Goshen College who are members of the Mennonite or Amish Mennonite church are requested to bring their church letters when coming to attend school. Those who prefer to hand their letters to the Amish Mennonite Church will be accommodated. Members of other denominations will be referred to the pastors of their respective churches in the city of Goshen, and should also bring their letters. It is the belief of the authorities of Goshen College that all students who are Christians should have a church home, and that faithful attendance at divine worship is a powerful influence for good in building strong Christian character."

Sunday school and church services were held for the first time at Goshen College on November 29. The attendance at Sunday school was one hundred one. N. E. Byers, C. K. Hostetler and E. J. Zook were elected superintendents of the Sunday school. Bishop D. J. Johns preached a sermon from the text, "None of these things move me." Bishop Johns also officiated in baptismal services on Saturday, April 30, 1904. This is significant because it shows that the Mennonite organization at the College was not really active. Bishop D. J. Johns was a member of the Amish Mennonite congregation at Clinton Frame.

In light of these facts it is not surprising that another organization was effected in October, 1904. On Wednesday evening, October 26, Bishop David Burkholder of the Mennonite church at Nappanee, known as Nappanee North, and Bishop D. J. Johns, of the Clinton Frame Amish Mennonite Church, organized a union congregation composed of both Mennonite and Amish Mennonite members. On Sunday, November 6, the first communion services were held at the College in charge of the two bishops who organized the congregation. At the same time the voice of the church was requested to set apart two students, Lydia Schertz and Anna Stalter, for the work in India. The congregation unanimously consented that they be sent to the foreign field.

The College congregation remained a union organization until the merger of the Mennonite and Amish Mennonite conferences in Indiana and Michigan. At first the congregation was under the dual pastorate of J. S. Hartzler and I. W. Royer, the former as a Mennonite and the latter as an Amish Mennonite. Hartzler, originally a member of the Maple Grove Amish Mennonite congregation at Topeka had been obliged to unite with the Mennonite congregation at Elkhart when he moved to Elkhart to take up his duties at the Institute and was thereafter considered a Mennonite.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Power of Non-Violence, by RICHARD B. GREGG. Published by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, 1934. Pages 359. Price $2.50.

Here is a book that is different. It grips the reader's interest from the start by the way it cuts directly across the conventional pattern of thought about war and peace, government, the use of force, and kindred ideas. It is not a doctrine that is proclaimed, but essentially a method of procedure for opposing violence, hatred, strife, wrong and injustice wherever found. The technique for this new procedure is outlined in detail by the author. The basis for the method proposed is a supreme love for individual persons, not a mild sentiment, but a real soul-force that is active, aggressive, prepared and disciplined for constructive suffering for truth. The Western mind so habitually thinks of force and coercion as the cornerstone of orderly society that it can hardly conceive of a way of living from which these were removed. Is this due to poverty of thought and smallness of faith, or to our superior power to discern reality?

The author begins by discussing at length the psychological foundations for the power of non-violent resistance. There is much food for thought in the detailed analysis made of those emotions and sentiments which are concerned in human relationships, and especially in aggression and resistance. In this way hatred, fear, and anger are analyzed in their interactions and interrelationships. The discussion, while based upon the findings of up-to-date psychology, is untechnical, lucid and direct. The psychology of non-violence, both the preparation of the non-violent resister for using this method and also its effect upon the user of violence, is described and well illustrated. Much space is used to demonstrate the application of non-violence to mass resistance, to the class struggle, and to the state. Queries and objections are answered not in a controversial, dogmatic spirit, but with respectful consideration and conviction.

For much of his illustrative material and for many details of procedure in non-violent resistance, the author has drawn heavily upon the experiences and writings of Mahatmi Gandhi. He spent nearly four years himself in India, studying at first hand and through personal contact the methods of Gandhi and his teachings. Fact and theory are combined here in a constructive way to draw a pattern of non-violence and its possibilities that cannot be dismissed with a bare gesture by those who believe that personal violence is a necessary part of the nature of things. "Social realists" of the school of Niebuhr and his followers may label a large part of this book as "romantic illusion," still such a tag should not deter lovers of peace from an unbiased reading and pondering of it.

The reviewer is not competent to undertake a detailed criticism of the subject matter presented here. Several points about which questions could be raised may be briefly noted in passing. Not all will concur with the assumption that underlies the author's thoroughly optimistic view of human nature and its possibilities. Through

training and self-discipline, together with the aid of psycho-analysis, the implication is that any number of people can become proficient in the practice of non-violent resistance. Prayer and a life of devotion to God are casually mentioned also as additional aids to such proficiency. Christians will insist on placing these means first as the absolute essentials. History seems to teach that the men and women who possess this unique "soul-force" are few and far between. Again the user of non-violence is told to regard the wrongs men do as mistakes on their part, and in general, to stress in his thinking those forces that unify mankind and ignore the divisive forces. The author, of course, is not speaking theologically here, but from a practical human viewpoint.

There are those who cannot feel altogether satisfied that the traditional nonresistance of certain religious sects, that is, the retiring, comparatively inactive, introverted type that is often tinged with defeatism, is identical with the zealous, aggressive activity that characterized the primitive Christian church. Such readers will find in this book many stimulating suggestions and ideas that will vitalize their thinking on this Christian principle which they cherish, and their activity as well. Others, and particularly such of the younger generation, as are inclined to feel as it is reported Alexander did, when he wept over the scarcity of worlds to conquer, can through these pages get a glimpse of yet vast continents of human and religious experience which are still practically unexplored. The possibilities that lie in the direction of aggressive love and non-violent resistance and their application to human relationships and the solving of social, economic, and moral problems constitutes a frontier where pioneering of the first order is urgently needed. Seekers for high adventure in moral and spiritual achievement can find ideas formulated here that will invite thought and reflection. All who are interested in the application of love and goodwill in human relationships should read and ponder the discussions in this volume.

Edward Yoder

Goshen College

The Conscription of Conscience, by Lowell Harris Coate, M.A., Ph.D. Published by The Stonehurst Press, 2826 Whittier Boulevard, Los Angeles, California. 1934. 127 pages. Price: cloth $1.00; paper 50 cents.

Friends of religious liberty see in some recent trends in the United States and political developments in some European countries encroachments on the domain of liberty which give them ground for grave concern. The mounting tide of nationalism with emphasis on a certain narrow type of patriotism outlines a critical issue for Christians who seriously place the sovereignty of God above that of Caesar. The idea of a totalitarian state to which men's minds are becoming gradually accustomed and the attempt to realize such a state, as in the present Germany, suggest the possibility that the issue for them may be actually drawn once more even after some centuries of practical religious liberty and freedom of conscience. Modern states are inclined to demand the absolute submission of the individual citizen in

all matters that they regard as pertaining to their own interest, without regard for the conscience or religious conviction of those who are affected by such demands.

Doctor Coate has performed a valuable service in collecting in this brief volume representative and significant data that reveal the tendency in our own country towards the conscription of conscience by the state. Since the close of the Great War numerous court decisions have sustained the interpretation that an oath to uphold the constitution of the United States includes the explicit willingness to bear arms and kill enemies in war time. Aliens have been denied admission to citizenship in a number of cases for refusing to subscribe to such an interpretation. The author reviews several of the prominent cases of such denial of citizenship with an interpretation of their significance. As an outstanding illustration of the government's attitude toward the individual conscience in war time he reviews with extended quotations the experience of Mr. Roger U. Baldwin who suffered arrest and imprisonment in 1917 for resisting conscription.

One chapter of the book surveys the protests expressed by church bodies, ministers, and religious editors against the court decisions which threaten freedom of conscience. The closing chapters summarize the student agitation of recent years against military training in schools and colleges. Notice is taken too of the organized propaganda for war resistance that has been getting under way in different countries of the world. The legal aspects of the conscription of conscience receive much attention throughout the book. The entire problem is set forth against the background of the historic struggle for human liberty and freedom. The philosophical and religious aspects are also touched upon.

The author credits the historic pacifist sects with the part they have played in maintaining freedom of conscience. One criticism the reviewer would offer is that the manner in which these sects are here linked up with the present struggle against conscription of conscience hardly does justice to the religious mainspring of their pacifism. The peace sects did not historically hold to nonresistance as a philosophical tenet on human liberty nor as a tool for social or political reform, but as an article of religious faith and practice. Their practice has brought forth some other results as valuable by-products; but their reason for practicing nonresistance was primarily obedience to Christ.

The author has written with conviction and force. The volume is timely and should do much to make Christian people conscious of the modern phases of the age old conflict between the claims of God and of Caesar for sovereignty over the conscience of man. The book is beautifully printed, though marred as a result of inadequate proofreading.

Edward Yoder

Goshen College

Religion Renounces War, by WALTER W. VAN KIRK. Willett, Clark & Co. 1934. x, 262 pages.

A significant change appears to have come over the churches of America and even of the world as touching their responsibility to wit-

ness against war and in favor of peace. At least so, if one may judge from the ponderous array of pronouncements and expressions which have been collected in this volume. Especially when compared with the unenviable record that the churches made in 1917-1918, the testimony put forth by them since the close of the Great War is striking in contrast. The preachers, many of them, appear to have definitely grounded the arms which they presented so enthusiastically then. Possibly a part of the present face-about attitude is a natural reaction from the disgraceful record of the immediate past. Nevertheless the tone of earnestness in recent statements against war and against the participation by Christians therein give ground for believing that a part of the new attitude represents genuine repentance and change of heart.

The six chapters of the book take up in turn different topics that have to do with war and peace in the modern world. The opening chapter shows Christians parting company with Caesar as many of them renounce war as a means for settling international disputes, pledge themselves not to support or bless war again, nor to participate in the sinful business of killing enemies. Succeeding chapters record the statements issued by church bodies and religious organizations and leaders on the Cause and Cure of War, the Reduction of Armaments, the Traffic in Arms, the Rights of Conscience. The closing chapter describes something of how The Churches of the World Combat the War System. The bulk of every chapter consists of exact quotations from official published statements, a fact that makes the book valuable for reference use as well as for information.

Some cynics will remark that all this is a tide of mere sentiment against war which will subside over night when it faces the actual test of war. It is likely enough that some who now declare themselves boldly against war would not long withstand propaganda and an active war psychology. On the contrary it is hardly possible for such a mass of sentiment not to leave a sizable precipitate of conviction in the hearts of many individual Christians, great enough to carry them through a test. Most churches have not a traditional or historic mental set against participation in war, and the official pronouncements of their Conferences, Councils, and Assemblies do not mean that the rank and file of their adherents have reached the same viewpoint or have accepted the same standards for themselves. The great task before these churches is that of teaching their people and educating them to this higher standard of obedience to Christ.

It is gratifying to observe in this cumulative testimony against war the presence of a distinctly religious note. The statement that war is a sin against God and humanity occurs repeatedly, as also the expressed conviction that war is contrary to the will of God and the teachings of Jesus Christ. This note while not dominant in the new testimony, is nevertheless prominent. Pessimistically to liken the present activity of the churches in favor of peace to the pre-war peace activity is hardly a fair comparison. Secular peace societies were then responsible mainly for the peace talk, which was based on humanitarian, social, and political considerations. The churches generally had concerned themselves but little with the matter, so that their pres-

ent interest in peace is a new conviction whatever its ultimate significance may be.

The author alludes to the historic pacifist commitments of Mennonites, Quakers, and Dunkards against war, as being so well known that he makes no extended references to their position. He does in the course of the book quote a few recent statements from Quaker and Brethren groups on problems pertaining to war and peace. The absence of any such recent testimony from Mennonites suggests the query whether there is not need for the repeated assertion of their definite testimony on the same current issues. Such testimony given in time of peace and in official ways by conferences might obviate the impression on the part of the general public that Mennonites are actively opposed to war and participation therein only when the issue itself threatens to disturb their security.

Edward Yoder

Goshen College